DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 084 235 SP 007 467

TITLE	The Profession Politics and Society. Yearbook 1972. Volume I: Proceedings.
INSTITUTION	American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	72
NOTE	123p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Order Department, American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Suite 610, One Dupont Circle, Washington, D.C. 20036 ($4.00)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58
DESCRIPTORS	*Annual Reports; *Conference Reports; Educational Policy; Federal Legislation; Performance Based Teacher Education; *Professional Associations; Social Problems; *Teacher Education

ABSTRACT

This document is the proceedings of the 1972 annual meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE); the theme was "The Profession, Politics and Society." The speeches and topics comprising this volume are the Thirteenth Charles W. Hunt Lecture: "Beyond the Upheaval," by Edward C. Pomeroy; "Policy and Decision Making in Teacher Education," with Mark Smith as chairman of the session; "Implications and Future Directions for Teacher Education and AACTE," with George W. Denemark as chairman of the session; "Performance-Based Teacher Education," by J. W. Maucker; "A Forward Look for Teacher Education," by Maurice B. Mitchell; "Social Problems and Teacher Education," by King V. Cheek; "Education and the Federal Dollar," by the Honorable William Proxmire, senator from Wisconsin; "China: A Government and a People," by Seymour Topping; and the winners and entries of AACT's Distinguished Achievement Awards. Volume 2 of the AACTE Yearbook for 1972 SP 007 468, is the AACTE Directory. (JA/CL)

THE PROFESSION
POLITICS AND
SOCIETY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
AACTE
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

Yearbook 1972
Volume I: Proceedings

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED 084235

SP 007 467

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Yearbook 1972 is published in two volumes:

- Volume 1: Proceedings of AACTE Annual Meeting
- Volume 2: Directory of AACTE Officers, Committees, and Member Institutions

© 1972 by
AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES
FOR TEACHER EDUCATION
One Dupont Circle, Washington, D. C. 20036

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number: 48-9984
Standard Book Number: 910052-64-6

Foreword

Each Annual Meeting provides an opportunity for representatives of member colleges and universities to refocus their attention to the Association's objectives, activities, and intentions. A searching examination is made of the societal and world context in which teacher educators must function and which they seek to influence. Individuals find professional and personal satisfactions for the time, energy, and money they and their institutions have invested. All of these Annual Meeting functions serve to provide opportunities for reassessing positions and charting AACTE activities aimed at improving teacher education in the months ahead. This Volume #1 of the 1972 Yearbook records selected proceedings of the Annual Meeting held in Chicago in February 1972.

The theme was "The Profession, Politics, and Society." Never before has teacher education been more visible in American life or vital to it. The Thirteenth Charles W. Hunt Lecture, "Beyond the Upheaval," sought to show how AACTE and the teacher education profession have moved into the mainstream of society's needs and to suggest future directions for efforts to improve education through continuously strengthened and vitalized school personnel preparation.

The range of concerns placed before this 1972 Annual Meeting is illustrated by the major presentations: "A Forward Look for Teacher Education," Maurice Mitchell; "Social Problems and Teacher Education," King V. Cheek; "Education and the Federal Dollar," The Honorable William Proxmire; and "China: A Government and a People," Seymour Topping.

Participants had numerous opportunities for selecting concurrent activities focused on topics as diverse as "Policy and Decision Making in Teacher Education," "Performance-Based Teacher Education," "Educational Renewal Sites and Teacher Centers," "Racism: Agenda for Action," "National Institute of Education," and "Manpower: Supply and Demand."

The Diffusion Center enabled participants to view reports on teacher education projects. The Distinguished Achievement Awards, now in their eighth year, continued to provide a means of identifying significant programs for the preparation of educational personnel.

Continuing a long and significant relationship, AACTE met with eight other professional groups in Chicago. This is but a surface indication of strong undercurrents of interaction which continue all year. The days of the Annual Meeting provide for a unique and desirable mixing of the professional alphabet:

AACTE, AESA, ATE, CITES, HES, NALS, NCEA, JDS, and SPE.* The Association is committed to the support of interorganizational cooperation, which is a hallmark of today's teacher education.

In 1972, two unique efforts were made to report on the Association's progress and intentions and to secure membership input on needed program directions. During the Annual Business Meeting, a mediated presentation provided in-depth reporting from the officers and staff. The Board of Directors provided a "hearing" for selected persons to propose AACTE actions and during which other participants were encouraged to comment on and/or question the effectiveness of the Association's efforts.

Association business was conducted: 22 new members were approved, bringing the current membership to 866; Auditing Committee reports were given; the Tellers Committee reported—all indications of a functioning organization. These kinds of activities were conducted quietly, overshadowed by events in Washington, Peking, or in the suite of a university seeking staff.

A review of the recent past encourages one as to the renewal capabilities of AACTE. There is a continuity, yet adaptation to new needs and determination to stimulate and guide change. There is stability gained by experience which, when melded with new leadership reflecting broadened involvement of different kinds of member institutions, minority group educators, and woman educators, augurs well for AACTE's effectiveness as a national agency.

The 1972 Annual Meeting closed an old AACTE year (its 52nd) and launched a new one. The numerous successes of the past year are attributable to the leadership of President Nathaniel H. Evers. He, with the active cooperation of the Association's officers, Board members, and staff, has guided the Association through reorganization and readjustment to a sound position for future service to teacher education and the nation. Credit for the success of the Annual Meeting program is due to its conception by the Planning Committee, co-chaired by Francis N. Hamblin and Edward C. Merrill, Jr., and its implementation by the professional staff, which was headed by Walter J. Mars who provided staff coordination for the meeting.

The new year, already begun, will involve the cooperation and support of all who are involved in the many facets of AACTE's effort to improve teacher education. AACTE faces a challenging, productive future at a time when there is great need for vision and the collective strength of its member institutions; its officers and staff; and its cooperative ventures with others.

EDWARD C. POMEROY
Executive Director

April 1972

---

*These letters mean American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, American Educational Studies Association, Association of Teacher Educators, Comparative and International Education Society, History of Education Society, National Association of Laboratory Schools, National Catholic Educational Association, The John Dewey Society, and The Society of Professors of Education.

Table of Contents

iii Foreword

2 Distinguished Achievement Awards

29 Thirteenth Charles W. Hunt Lecture: Beyond the Upheaval
Edward C. Pomeroy

46 Policy and Decision Making in Teacher Education
Mark Smith, Chairman

59 Implications and Future Directions for Teacher Education and AACTE
George W. Denemark, Chairman

74 Performance-Based Teacher Education
J. W. Maucker

78 A Forward Look for Teacher Education
Maurice B. Mitchell

87 Social Problems and Teacher Education
King V. Cheek

96 Education and the Federal Dollar
The Honorable William Proxmire

106 China: A Government and a People
Seymour Topping

Note:

The Association's Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws were carried in the *1971 Yearbook*.

The Distinguished Achievement Awards

Excellence in Teacher Education

Encouragement Of Excellence

Each year, since 1965, the Association invites its member institutions to enter the Distinguished Achievement Awards (DAA) Program in the knowledge that commitment to the goal of excellence is vital to these colleges and universities preparing 90 percent of the nation's teachers.

It is well to pause at this time—despite the everyday pressures and demands—and renew that commitment to the achievement of excellence. Few of us would deny that the word 'innovative' suffers from tired blood. It is all too easy to mistake change for achievement when new labels have been attached to the same old ways.

Real achievement has something to do with answering a genuine need and with giving untold time and thought. It is hard won. Such achievement of excellence by a college or university raises all of the teacher education profession.

The Association commends those institutions cited for excellence this year as it does all departments, schools, and colleges of education that continually reassess and upgrade their programs.

An extra dividend coming out of the DAA Program is the valuable cross-section of currents and trends provided by the entries. These characteristics particularly were evident in the programs submitted as entries:

- cooperating with local school districts for earlier and longer field experiences,
- using a systems approach, often performance-based,
- making a program student-oriented for individualized and flexible instruction,
- devising sound evaluative techniques to measure the program,
- providing program alternatives,
- using multimedia substantially,
- fitting a program to local needs, and
- involving faculty outside of teacher education.

These interests are healthy reassurances that teacher education is coping *positively* with problems at a time when money is scarce, budgets have been curtailed, and yet program 'miracles' are still demanded by the taxpayer.

The Association is grateful to the hard-working DAA panel of judges who undertook the decision-making: James Warner, panel chairman and assistant director of the Iowa State University Information Service in Ames, Iowa; Verna Fancett, chairman of the Social Studies Department of the Jamesville-DeWitt Central High School in Jamestown, New York; Vernon S. Gerlach, chairman of Educational Technology and Library Science at Arizona State University's College of Education in Tempe, Arizona; Kenneth R. Williams, president of Winston-Salem State University in Winston-Salem, North Carolina; and Donald W. Robinson, dean of the Youngstown State University School of Education in Youngstown, Ohio.

Edward C. Pomeroy
Executive Director, AACTE

Education
By
Mutual
Agreement
Temple
Philadelphia
Portal School
Concept

THE DISTINGUISHED ACHIEVEMENT AWARD
TEMPLE UNIVERSITY

P.R. Anderson
President

Paul W. Eberman
Dean, College of Education

Roderick A. Hilsinger
Chairman, Division of
Curriculum and Instruction

Betty B. Schantz
Assistant Dean
University-School Relations

In November 1963 – two months after Paul Eberman began as dean of the College of Education at Temple University – *The Philadelphia Magazine* ran an article which tore apart the city schools, piece-by-piece style. Eberman recalls that many of his staff stopped him in the hall to ask, "Do these things *really* go on in the public schools?" Temple is located in the middle of the Model Cities Area. "We had better go out there and find out," he answered.

Like most colleges in those expansive, booming early '60's, Temple's College of Education sent most of its student teachers into the fringe areas or even the suburbs; at the time, there was not a single organized practicum situation in the inner city.

"We began," Eberman explains, "on the assumption that a college of education in the kind of urban setting like ours has a strong obligation to relate to and improve nearby schools," But, he candidly admits, if he'd put such a commitment up to a vote by the 110 faculty members at the time, "I'd probably have received a resounding 'no.'"

Teacher education, like all professions, is not without its sacred cows or fixed notions. Notion one: only a few student teachers should be placed in each school; principals encouraged this view by saying to the university, "Don't give me more than two or three students." Next, there was the commonplace that, because student teachers were spread out in all directions, teaching supervisors had to spend a lot of time on the road driving from school to school. More ingrained, perhaps, was the notion that student teachers should be under the complete control of the education faculty. Notion four categorized preservice and in-service training as parallel but unrelated operations. The fifth unshakable conviction was that a decent professional education course could only be taught in a sterile campus classroom, free from the germs of the real world. Finally, the idea persevered in teacher education circles that local teachers' organizations should not have a voice in how teacher preparation took place, even with respect to the practicum side.

Temple used the years between 1963 and 1970 to lay the groundwork for serving the inner-city schools. A nucleus of the College of Education faculty began a program in the inner-city area, and eventually a College Department of Urban Education was established. When prospective staff members were interviewed in those growth years during which the College of Education faculty tripled, they were specifically queried about what urban education experience they had had and what degree of commitment they held.

In 1970, the sacred cows were finally sent to pasture when Temple initiated its version of the portal school concept: by mutual agreement, the university, the public schools, the teachers' union, and the community began to operate four portal schools.

The portal school concept is a reallocation of existing resources through concentration of programs such as tutorial, student teaching, graduate internship, and special projects like EPICT, Teacher Corps, the Triple T, and veterans programs. Reallocation is a cooperative affair. The university in effect says to the public school system that rather than each segment maintaining separate and distinct cadres of coordinators, lead teachers, supervisors, and curriculum experts, why not join forces and make joint appointments? The goal is to create a total educational program that will meet the individual needs of each portal school.

Such an arrangement gnaws away at the traditional barriers of discrete educational authority; the university, school system, union, and community must each surrender a small portion of its sanctuary in order to achieve a greater total.

The four Temple-Philadelphia portal schools were located in predominantly black neighborhoods; one school had a large concentration of Puerto Ricans. They were low on the socioeconomic scale. All four schools were near the university: the closest was two blocks away and the farthest was 15 minutes.

The size varied: the smallest of the four schools had 900 students; the largest had 1,200.

Each portal school set up its own advisory board composed of representatives from the university, school, union, community, and student body. Agreement on issues, it was decided, would be reached *by mutual consent* rather than by vote. A written contract was drawn up for approval.

In the give-and-take process, problems were inevitable. Of particular note was Temple's decision to include the teachers' union as a separate party rather than follow the traditional view that the union is part of the school system. The action was pragmatic, according to Roderick Hilsinger, Temple curriculum and instruction chairman. "I do not think there is an option," he contends. "I, too, would like to see the union consider itself part of the school system, central administration, and the rest; but I think that at this point in time the union is in the earlier stages of formation, and it will take a couple of years to get beyond that point."

Betty Schantz, the university link with each portal school, believes that "by getting together with the union and explaining the program and benefits possible for teachers under the concept, we have avoided many problems which we might have faced in the future."

She admits regret over some things which were not possible. "I am not as starry-eyed as I once was, feeling that I might like to hold teachers accountable and wanting the union to support this." She recalls the negotiations and the union decisions not to have its members on the advisory board vote and not to allow program evaluation by union teachers. Only teachers from Temple could participate in evaluation. "I would have liked to have had agreement that the university program would be evaluated by every participant, not just the university-trained ones. . . . I lost that."

But the union gave a little, too. Its most significant concession was a willingness to hold five to 10 precent of the open teaching positions for teacher education purposes. The way was cleared for a principal to hire student teachers after graduation if he was impressed with their competencies.

The second most serious problem has rested with the community side of the quadrilateral arrangement. "We have had difficulty," according to Dr. Schantz, "in getting parents on the advisory boards who really speak for the community." The qualification is clear: a parent must have a child currently attending the school. "So far," she says, "our parent representation comes from a very small group of parents who feel welcome in the school, who are there for other purposes, and who are known to most of the school personnel. It is one of the program's weak points."

The concept is now in its second year. Four more schools will be added next year for a total of eight. While assessment would be premature, the question of accomplishment is inevitable. Hilsinger feels the program has meant a new institutional direction in teacher education. It has made, he contends, a difference in Temple's own back yard by establishing an institutional commitment which deals with most of the college's programs, by altering the university reward system so that demonstration of superior teaching in the public schools pays off on the level of research and publishing, and by trying to teach teachers through experience with real and poor children. But, above all, he points out, "It has tried to make a beginning on a broad enough base to be sustained, rather than vanish like the multitude of 'innovative symbolic crusades' which have emerged over the past 15 years."

Temple hopes to keep the portal concept flexible and open. Its staff estimates that a portal school will operate from two to five years. Once a school is running under its own steam and the advisory board is working effectively, the portal concept will no longer be needed there; it can then move on to another school. Hopefully what will remain is the fundamental and sound philosophy that educators and laymen, heretofore laboring in "separate but equal" bailiwicks, can work together by mutual consent in their common interest—children.

Much of the information for this article has been based upon remarks made during a 1971 AACTE Annual Meeting concurrent session on the Philadelphia Portal Schools Concept. Participating from Temple were Dean Eberman, Dr. Hilsinger, and Dr. Schantz.

FOR DISTINGUISHED ACHIEVEMENT: AUSTIN COLLEGE, SHERMAN, TEXAS

President
John D. Moseley

Seeking ways to place effective teachers in the classrooms, Austin has committed itself to a highly individualized, performance-based program. Built solidly from a liberal arts base, the Austin Teacher Program covers five academic years, terminating in the Masters of Arts degree.

Four objectives have been set: to meet each student where he is and facilitate his continual progress; to provide long-term and in-depth involvement to enable the student to mature as the program unfolds; to involve the student as director of his own learning; and to increase opportunities for preparation in his academic field.

The student, in consultation with a faculty member, selects behavior patterns and identifies the concepts and skills related to them. A contract is drawn up outlining the competencies to be demonstrated.

Just as the student's role is more individualized in the program, the faculty member is a coordinator of activities for the student. The professor is a model for his students—trying to break the chain of teachers teaching the way they were taught. He is a team member who must help to keep the program open and flexible. The temptation to slip back into the old mold by teaching to groups instead of individuals or by falling back into the security of lectures is a clear and present danger. To avoid the pitfall, faculty members meet weekly to discuss the coordinator role. They also spend a few days at the beginning, in the middle, and at the end of the academic year to take an analytical look at the entire teacher education design. Expertise from consultants and evaluation by students also help.

Austin College believes that it has faced up to many of the problems plaguing teacher education; the experience of change has been both jarring and stimulating. Rather than offering its program as 'the model' for change, the college urges other teacher education institutions to seek new ways which will fit their own particular needs.

FOR DISTINGUISHED ACHIEVEMENT: PERU STATE COLLEGE, PERU, NEBRASKA

President
Neal S. Gomon

Under the Nebraska Head Start Supplementary Training Program, Peru State College began a pilot project four years ago, aided by funds from the Office of Economic Opportunity. The project serves the needs of low-income paraprofessionals employed by the Head Start Program as either teacher aides or social service aides and who lack formal education background or have been away from the classroom for many years.

The participants are typically middle-aged working mothers with family responsibilities. Many are members of minority groups. Under the special program at Peru, they are able to enter college and take courses related to their work as paraprofessionals. Upon completion of 64 credit hours, they receive a certificate of competency. If they wish to go beyond this point, they can work for an Associate in Arts degree or a Bachelor of Science in early childhood education.

Typical of the courses designed for the program is the Bilingual Bicultural Education Workshop. Primarily for Mexican-Americans, the sessions offer discussion of curriculum materials for Chicano Head Start children. It has an added one credit-hour course in environmental education.

The pilot project has worked well largely because of the relationships between the college and local Head Start personnel. The latter have identified educational needs around which the special courses have been structured.

Peru State College has learned much from administering the program. For one thing, in developing a program responsive to specific educational needs, the college has had to modify the traditional course sequence by offering professional courses in the first or second year of college. It has developed the degree aspect of the program, taking many of the participants beyond the certificate portion. It has further recognized that courses must be scheduled at times and locations which are convenient to the students. It has had to keep flexible in terms of admissions policy, curriculum development, faculty assignment, and delivery of educational programs.

FOR DISTINGUISHED ACHIEVEMENT: UNIVERSITY OF DAYTON, DAYTON, OHIO

President
Rev. Raymond Roesch

One of the pressing problems in teacher education is identifying the classroom teachers to guide laboratory experiences. Usually, teachers take turns at being supervising teachers for one term at a time. This practice tends to discourage continuity or improvement.

Assuming that there are classroom teachers specifically interested in teacher education, it is possible that these persons could become involved in formulating a new role for the classroom supervisor, requiring the establishment of partner relationships between the university and school systems.

With the view in mind of future partnership schools, the University of Dayton, along with various Dayton schools, has developed a program which emphasizes a new role for the classroom supervising teacher. The role is much more than an extension or expansion of the present one: it encompasses responsibilities to students at various levels of development; it assumes more responsibility for the sequential development of the prospective teacher; and it requires more sophisticated skills in demonstrating, facilitating, and analyzing the learning of young adults. Program participants must define the competencies to be sought, the formal and informal experiences to be provided, the materials of instruction, and the materials and procedures to be used to assess professional progress.

After meetings, seminars, conferences, and field trials with the university faculty, cooperating teachers, school administrators, and education students, program planners have found these competencies to be central:

- demonstrating theory in practice,
- serving as a model for learners,
- showing group dynamics in action,
- using instructional media,
- analyzing initial teaching behavior, and
- participating in continuous curriculum development.

Without a new role for the classroom supervisor, good partnership schools, the university is convinced, cannot function effectively.

FOR DISTINGUISHED ACHIEVEMENT: UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON, SEATTLE, WASHINGTON

President
Charles E. Odegaard

Students majoring in education at the University of Washington can choose one of two paths: the traditional way of theory courses and academic preparation culminating in one quarter of student teaching or an alternative program, Teacher Education: Performance and Field Oriented (TEPFO), which *correlates* theory and practice for juniors, seniors, and postgraduates.

The TEPFO alternative resembles an earlier university effort, the 1967 Northshore Project, a coalition with the local school district and education association. Northshore featured:

- a performance-based, field-oriented experience,
- a cadre of clinical professors,
- the steering committee approach,
- a coordination of campus and field experiences,
- an in-service education program for field associate teachers,
- temporary certification for project interns in the final phase, and
- special screening and selection of interns.

Two years after the project began, a self-study program led to a faculty and student task force report setting priorities for change. The report recommended an admissions program based on well-defined criteria, a predetermined enrollment geared to available college resources, a specified block of time to which a student is committed full-time, a multiple-track system to help students with diverse backgrounds, a performance-based, field-oriented approach providing integration of theory and practice, and a close campus-field relationship.

Students participating in TEPFO must make an early decision to schedule program requirements in a block of time which precludes other academic work during the interval. They must further recognize that success will be based mainly on performance rather than on strictly cognitive experiences.

Faculty in the TEPFO program must be prepared to cope with management details, including frequent visits to the field for translation of performance data.

CERTIFICATES OF RECOGNITION:

Western Washington State College
Bellingham, Washington

President
Charles J. Flora

Western Washington's performance-based field-centered program is located in six Seattle schools (K-12) which are ethnically, socially, and economically mixed. Education students complete all of the program's professional components in two quarters and, upon graduation, are issued provisional certification to teach.

The program differs from other performance-based programs which are focused mainly on teacher behavior. The ultimate criterion used to test a prospective teacher's effectiveness in this clinical program is the behavior of his pupils, particularly their achievement of specific goals.

Major components are (1) an in-service course for teachers who will supervise the college's student teachers and (2) an entry program, studies in foundations, a laboratory component, and a practicum for the education student.

Program evaluation is continuous and characterized by immediate feedback to clinical students and their supervisors. It focuses on products such as the instructional packages for the prospective teachers as well as the learning outcomes of their students. It likewise deals with processes such as the techniques which student teachers employ as they work with pupils.

To date only three of 80 students have failed to complete this performance-based system. The major variable is the time needed to complete instructional packages, but performance remains the critical variable.

California State College, Los Angeles
Los Angeles, California

President
John A. Greenlee

The Five Points On-Site Teacher Education Program places a professional sequence of courses in school sites located in neighborhoods of varied racial or ethnic origins. The college's secondary education program includes a school in a black area, another in a Mexican-American one, a third in a mixed neighborhood undergoing transition, a fourth in a relatively stable middle-class Caucasian school district noted for experimentation. The fifth and final site is the traditional campus setting at California State College.

These off-campus sites assume various designs, often radically departing from the usual method of separate course packages.

A typical program covers educational sociology, psychology, curriculum, methods, and audiovisual education. On an agenda might be, for example, small group seminars, participation-observation in selected classrooms, attendance at school board meetings, work in a media center, individual tutoring or conferences, or work in various school offices.

Subject matter of the program are the on-site school, its faculty, students, resources, problems, and possibilities. Coursework blends gradually into participation-observation and student teaching. On-site student teachers begin at varied times, depending upon their individual readiness and the combined judgments of both college instructors and supervising teachers.

CERTIFICATES OF RECOGNITION:

The Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio

President
Novice G. Fawcett

Originally a funded pilot program, the Teacher Education Program in Science and Mathematics Education has become the established program at the university for preparing science and math teachers. Involved are faculty members from science and mathematics and from the College of Education as well as personnel from the Columbus public schools and other schools in Franklin County.

Students are actively teaching at elementary, junior high, and senior high school levels during four or five quarter sequences. Emphasis during the junior year is upon the individual pupil: first, in a one-to-one tutorial setting, then as a teacher in small-group activities, and finally as class instructor.

The focus of the two-quarter senior program is the socioeconomic setting and its effect upon the school: first, there is a half-day teaching assignment divided in time between two schools in contrasting contexts (inner city, suburban); then there is a full-day teaching assignment in a single school, usually one from the past quarter's experience.

Evaluative devices—observations, audiotapes, and videotapes—are employed throughout the program to help preservice teachers evaluate their own classroom performances.

Future plans include increasing in-service work, assisting cooperating schools in curriculum development, and providing more community involvement for student teachers.

Eastern Montana College
Billings, Montana

President
Stanley J. Heywood

Eastern Montana's Environmental Education Program has been built without federal, state, school district, or college funds: it has been totally supported financially by the Parent-Teacher Associations of the involved schools. The program has grown in five years from involving one sixth-grade classroom of 29 children in the spring of 1967 to 33 sixth-grade classrooms from 12 schools totaling 900 children in the spring of 1971.

The program concentrates largely on the sixth-grade level; the college hopes eventually it will cover all of K-12. Children are exposed to these components: the concept of the earth as a closed system, dependent upon its own resources; the concept of biological ecosystems, emphasizing the interdependence and change; the concept of human ecosystems, particularly cultural, social, political, economic aspects; concepts of environmental management; and concepts of our cultural institutions, including study of population problems.

A major factor is the teacher's ability to guide pupils in the learning of these concepts. Both preservice and in-service workshops prepare teachers with useful attitudes and skills for environmental education classes. Also, college students are trained in many aspects of camp-counsellorship and as backup instructors for the camp program.

CERTIFICATE OF RECOGNITION:

Kutztown State College
Kutztown, Pennsylvania

President
Lawrence M. Stratton

Kutztown State College's Art Education Program, which produces many art teachers for the Pennsylvania schools, goes beyond the usual art education program. The aim is toward an artist-educator and the college's program is infused with the underlying philosophies that creative activity and all phases of living are interrelated, that art is a major force in communication, that the several dimensions of art have common and specific characteristics, and that the creative process is both objective and subjective, involving not only technique but also intellect and emotion.

Facilities are extensive: 16 major studios, an art gallery, a lecture hall, conference rooms, and staff offices.

Art specialization consists of 44 semester hours of studio courses, covering a wide range of required plus two elective ones. Students must do two clock hours of work in order to earn one semester hour of credit.

The professional education aspect includes professional orientation, audiovisual education, educational psychology, the methods course *Art in Education*, and a full 18-week semester of student teaching.

Art in Education develops an awareness of the place of art in schools, a knowledge of child development, insights into theories of learning, and some practical aspects of classroom activities and management.

ENTRIES

Alabama State University
Montgomery, Alabama

Interested particularly in producing competent teachers who are alert to the behavioral responses and the needs of deprived pupils, the Experiment in Teaching the Disadvantaged helps student teachers identify disadvantaged pupils in a class of 30 seventh graders enrolled in the Lowndes County Training School; the student teachers then prescribe programs in the areas of communication and mathematics.

Allen University
Columbia, South Carolina

Emphasizing education in relation to human development, the Early Childhood Development Program has been structured as a career ladder and features methods and procedures built upon skills, training, and small-group instruction; facilities include a curriculum laboratory, reading centers, and an audiovisual area.

Appalachian State University
Boone, North Carolina

As part of its participation in the Phi Delta Kappa Teacher Education on Human Rights, Appalachian has committed its teacher education program to developing teachers who will demonstrate in their behavior a strong commitment to the full dignity, respect, and value of each student.

Arizona State University
Tempe, Arizona

A school-university partnership to establish a cooperative clinical teaching center, the non-funded program begun in 1971 features a two-year plan during which 36 undergraduate elementary education majors blend field experiences with coursework in classroom laboratories taught by college and public school personnel.

Avila College
Kansas City, Missouri

With a genuine need in the Kansas City community for more special education teachers in the areas of learning and/or behavior disorders, the college started a four-year teacher training program which prepares the student for certification in three areas: elementary education, learning disabilities, and behavior disorders; from the beginning of their college experience, students work with children in the campus laboratory class.

Black Hills State College
Spearfish, South Dakota

Nearing the final phase of one of the first undergraduate Teacher Corps programs in the country, the college program is shaped so that participants complete two years of college and go out into the field for two years of classroom experience; they return to the campus in the summers for a series of seminars and workshops.

California State College, Long Beach
Long Beach, California

In the Secondary Teacher Training Experimental Program which combines college curriculum with student teaching experiences, students are assigned to an off-campus secondary learning center where they spend a semester teaching two classes daily and take a matching seminar taught by a professor-in-residence.

Cardinal Stritch College
Milwaukee, Wisconsin

Designed to give varied and ongoing experiences starting with the freshman year, the Teacher Education Program's Five Phases reflects the present focus of teacher preparation on early involvement; students are given opportunities to coordinate the more theoretically-based coursework with practical laboratory experiences in public and private schools.

Castleton State College
Castleton, Vermont

The college's teacher education program changes include a teaming effort through statewide and local cooperatives and a concerted search for varied resources which would provide information regarding methods and materials of instruction.

Chadron State College
Chadron, Nebraska

To make college learning and public school teaching more relevant, the college's Outdoor Environmental Education has an interdisciplinary approach to teacher education centered around the natural laboratory of the out-of-doors; program includes prestudent teaching experiences during which students work with sixth graders from among 11 school districts.

Central State University
Edmond, Oklahoma

In its Early Childhood Teacher Training Project, the university is using a school-based demonstration kindergarten for practicum experiences; partially funded through an E.D.P.A. Title V grant, the certification project concentrates on working with the disadvantaged in psychological aspects, diagnosis of learning readiness, auditory and visual perceptual training, and methods for developing cognitive skills.

Central Washington State College
Ellensburg, Washington

Recognizing the need for colleges and public schools to work more effectively together in developing education programs for students coming from varying economic, cultural, and racial backgrounds, the Department of Education—together with several school districts in the Yakima Valley and the State Department of Public Instruction—established a Center for the Study of Migrant and Indian Education to coordinate educational efforts, give training, and help develop programs and instructional materials for the disadvantaged.

Clark College
Atlanta, Georgia

The Clark College-Atlanta Academy Theatre-Atlanta Public Schools Coalition is a competency-based teacher education program that identifies desirable performance standards for teachers, evaluates the trainee's achievement of those performance levels, and observes the effect of the trainee's performance upon the public school students with whom they work; 10 undergraduates attend morning classes at the theatre and the college, spend afternoons working as Urban Corps Interns in supervised elementary classes, and also engage in self-examination at workshops.

College of Mount St. Joseph on the Ohio
Mount St. Joseph, Ohio

In the college's mathematics laboratory, prospective teachers strengthen their own insights as they help young learners acquire mathematical concepts; student teachers also learn, through work with individual children or small groups, how to interact with pupils at different stages of development.

College of Saint Elizabeth
Convent Station, New Jersey

Believing that prospective teachers should have a maximum of teaching experiences which, in turn, should be related to the theoretical concepts, the college is using two courses as a base for making the public schools a laboratory: (1) "Field Experiences in Education" for sophomore elementary education majors and (2) "The Dynamism of Change" for senior student teachers.

Concordia College
Moorhead, Minnesota

The Self-Teacher Actualization Program (S-TAP) involves each elementary education major during one semester of his junior year with teaching in the public schools; five curriculum areas are covered: reading, language arts, social studies, mathematics, and science.

Concordia Teachers College
Seward, Nebraska

Through its IMPACT program, the college is encouraging student involvement with the community by its support of 123 projects, including the reading of stories to rural children in an empty saloon, tutorial work on nearby Indian reservations, and planning and conducting a community preschool center; the program has led to curricular change reflecting faculty and student ownership.

Creighton University
Omaha, Nebraska

Concerned with the needs for more practicality in teacher education courses and for earlier experiences with public school pupils, the university's cooperative program begins with tutorial work in a nonschool setting, progresses to service as teacher aides in psychology and methods classes, and ends in the complete classroom teaching assignment; students spend over 700 clock hours in direct association with the children.

Delaware State College
Dover, Delaware

In order to bring into the college persons from low-income areas who would not normally enter and who might not consider teaching as a career, the college initiated an Experimental Program in Teacher Education, assisted by the Wilmington public schools and other agencies; the program is designed to allow the student to spin in and spin out at any point along the career lattices.

Delta State College
Cleveland, Mississippi

Designed to help elementary teachers develop materials and methods for teaching mathematics to low achievers, Project SOSO (Save Our Slow Ones), begun by the Mathematics Department, follows the hypothesis that a child—and particularly a low achiever—will learn math better if he is also given a manipulative device; project concentrates on trying out devices in the classroom and then working them into course material for elementary teachers.

District of Columbia Teachers College
Washington, D.C.

Placed in a special room within an elementary school, the practicing teacher is asked to work on a particular concept, skill, or performance criterion; emphasis is placed upon developing teachers who can deal realistically with problems facing the present generation, particularly the disadvantaged in an urban setting.

Dominican College of San Rafael
San Rafael, California

The college's teacher education program, containing 52 performance-based objectives for the prospective teacher, evolved cooperatively from critical needs identified by its students, staff, and representatives from the public schools of Marin County: (1) earlier entrance into the program, (2) increased contact with children, (3) individualization of instruction, (4) unification of content and process, and (5) emphasis upon self-evaluation, autonomy, and accountability.

East Tennessee State University
Johnson City, Tennessee

Trading the traditional courses, credits, grades, and hours for components, modules, module clusters, behavioral objectives, and varied performance modes, the university's Division of Laboratory Services has moved much of its teacher education into the public schools; a Teacher Corps program combined with Individually-Guided Education (IGE) have helped establish a working relationship between the College of Education and several schools.

Eastern Illinois University
Charleston, Illinois

To strengthen the critical phase of student teaching, the university started an experimental summer program to encourage student teachers to bring and discuss problems they had encountered during the practicum.

Eastern New Mexico University
Portales, New Mexico

Recognizing the student's need for more relevant and meaningful educational experiences, the university's Interdisciplinary Internships with various state agencies place the student at a facility for a semester, involving him in individual and group psychotherapy; typical of the facilities used by the interns are Las Vegas Mental Hospital, Las Lunas Medical Hospital Training School, Albuquerque Alcohol Rehabilitation Center, and Fort Bayard Geriatric Hospital.

Eastern Washington State College
Cheney, Washington

The college serves a wide range of clientele—from the urban and suburban people of the Spokane vicinity to the sparsely-populated rural areas, including several Indian reservations; to serve them, the college has turned to videotaping as a partial solution to professional admissions interviews, urban and rural in-service programs, teacher placement, microteaching, and other critical needs.

Edgecliff College
Cincinnati, Ohio

Working toward earlier student-teaching involvement as a self-screening device before the student makes a career commitment, the college has implemented a Four-Year Elementary Education Program which features 20 hours of directed observation and participation during each of the first three years and a final Professional Year; a systems approach is used, emphasizing performance objectives, production, media material use, strategies of instruction, and types of evaluation.

Fitchburg State College
Fitchburg, Massachusetts

Spanning the continuum from preservice through in-service, the college's Teacher Education Center is directed by a systems team using a clinical approach of diagnosis, prescription, treatment, and evaluation; interdisciplinary themes such as Peoples, Environment, Communications, Government, Space and Time, Energy, and Occupation crisscross the curriculum.

Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University
Tallahassee, Florida

Pinpointing three specific needs of (1) knowing the subject of mathematics, (2) keeping up with information on its teaching, and (3) becoming aware of human relations problems in newly-desegregated schools, the Florida A&M University TDDS Mathematics Institute funded by EDPA, features an eight-week summer session during which college staff members and visiting consultants from this country and England work with 36 participants from the state of Florida in specific teaching situations, followed by discussions centering around the three needs.

Florida Atlantic University
Boca Raton, Florida

The university, helped by the State Division of Youth Services, has designed a special program in which some 50 juniors and seniors live, study, and work for 18 months within a state correctional institution located in Okeechobee where they participate as subprofessionals in every facet of the institution's program; students work 25 clock hours per week and attend classes in the late afternoon and early evening.

Florida Technological University
Orlando, Florida

In the Florida Technological University Career Teacher Program, students are exposed fully to the realities of teaching, with an early opportunity to decide if they wish to pursue it as a career; they are encouraged to blend theoretical concepts with practical experiences, work in off-campus Teacher Education Centers, and maintain close touch with university and public school personnel.

Immaculate Heart College
Los Angeles, California

Recognizing that, even though no single prescription for good teaching exists, four elements—early and continuous observation and participation along with reflection and dialogue on content, values, and method—contribute to effective teacher preparation, the college has built a program that centers around learning as a process incorporating all of the undergraduate experiences and featuring a series of concurrent seminars.

Indiana State University
Terre Haute, Indiana

By restructuring and revising the curriculum, reallocating and recombining available resources, and making the most of existing facilities, the elementary teacher education program has been improved in five ways: more flexibility in fitting the general program to individual needs, earlier experience with children, greater emphasis upon two curriculum theories and instruction blocks, use of behavioral objectives to determine and evaluate content, and development of student teaching centers.

Inter American University of Puerto Rico
Hato Rey, Puerto Rico

Phase II, a sequel to the university's Open Poly Dimension Endeavor, provides a series of experiences structured to obtain student response to problems of what to teach, how to teach, and what competencies are needed; the one-year pre-internship laboratories, directed by a bilingual professor, form the core of the project.

Iowa State University
Ames, Iowa

Human and technological resources have been organized into a student-centered, individualized study program within these guidelines: recognizing resources as all things from which people learn, operating a center as a model for elementary and secondary schools, employing self-directed planning and production, and using a differentiated staff to assist students at all stages.

Kansas State College of Pittsburg
Pittsburg, Kansas

Three phases were involved in the Elementary School Project in Mathematics: (1) updating the mathematics background of teachers through a six-week summer institute, (2) assisting key personnel to assume leadership roles through an in-service course, and (3) setting up monthly in-service meetings for all elementary classroom teachers in the program; program is jointly operated by the college and the Pittsburg public schools.

Kearney State College
Kearney, Nebraska

For better preparation of prospective teachers on international issues and happenings, the college developed the Annual Midwest Conference on World Affairs, planned and conducted by a committee of faculty and students; eight conferences have been conducted so far, bringing together representatives of many nations.

Lee College
Cleveland, Tennessee

The Division of Education undertook a study to find out what characteristics administrators, principals, and superintendents considered essential for teaching success; sources were local school systems in which Lee College graduates were teaching, and the findings have helped the college in planning and improving its program for preparing teachers.

Lewis and Clark College
Portland, Oregon

Needing to utilize the secondary student teaching staff more efficiently, the college began its Individualized Student Teaching, a systematic approach to field practicum; the program features (1) individualization of the teacher experience; (2) a plan for a 10-week term of student teaching; (3) use of videotape and analysis; (4) a wide variety of philosophies and procedures in cooperation with public school cooperating teachers; and (5) placement of college staff in supervisory roles.

Mankato State College
Mankato, Minnesota

In order to prepare students from rural midwestern communities who go into school systems located in intercultural communities, the college's Introductory Urban Block gives early experiential education involving academic instruction with inner-city school and community involvement; students live in St. Paul and work in community projects.

Marillac College
St. Louis, Missouri

Intended as the first in a series to bridge the preservice and in-service gap, the primary math skill sequence program was designed by 764 participants in eight national in-service workshops, sponsored by the college's teacher education faculty to give the teacher an accurate skill inventory for the individual learner; the charts of skills can also be used as a report to parents.

Mars Hill College
Mars Hill, North Carolina

In order to lengthen student teaching, put more relevance into methods courses, and increase involvement of public school personnel in teacher education, the Education Department, in cooperation with the Buncombe County and Eden City Schools, began an Education Internship Program involving 22 college juniors in a year of internship; courses are taught by personnel from the college and public schools.

McPherson College
McPherson, Kansas

Responding to student insistence that education be 'real' and that classroom experience begin earlier, the Education Department is emphasizing a laboratory-oriented curriculum, making the world at large the laboratory; students are placed in public schools as tutors, aides, special methods teachers, and student teachers, and they are further required to spend at least one Interterm in a different social or school environment.

Miami University
Oxford, Ohio

The university has developed a program of preparation in which the teacher-candidate must assume the role of an active participant along with university personnel and public school teachers in evaluating his own progress; this new role for the student is firmly based upon early school contact and relevant field experiences in the schools as bases for making career judgments.

Mount Marty College
Yankton, South Dakota

Responding to Mount Marty College graduates' suggestions that student teaching time be increased, the teacher education department initiated an experimental full semester of practice; a year later, the program was adopted for all prospective teachers, with selected faculty members preparing individual learning packets as theory guides.

Mount St. Mary's College
Los Angeles, California

Using the nontraditional method of internship to educate teachers from funds given by the school district, the Inner-City College-Community Teacher Education Program provides an intense preservice segment, followed by on-site participation with part-time salary, and finally full participation with regular salary provisions; professional personnel were recruited from among Cuban refugees living at the time in Florida, ex-aerospace engineers, uncommitted liberal arts majors at the college, and suburban teachers.

Northeast Louisiana University
Monroe, Louisiana

Seeking more teaching contacts and experiences for student teachers, the college has worked out a Laboratory Experience program for all education students that schedules second semester freshmen into schools for visits, includes sophomores in classroom activities, and places sophomores and juniors in tutorial and monitorial situations; concurrent with this early school involvement is a program of media proficiency directed by personnel in the Northeast Media Center.

Northeast Missouri State College
Kirksville, Missouri

Noting the scarcity of available elementary and secondary schools to accommodate *substantial* programs of laboratory experiences, the college implemented a Teaching Skills Center for preservice and in-service use; the center's coordinating office and three training labs give a carefully articulated sequence of experiences in audiovisual aids, preparation of instructional materials, and videotaped microteaching.

Northeastern Illinois University
Chicago, Illinois

The project Duality in Society, Duality in Teacher Education attempts to prepare the student teacher to function both in an inner-city setting where children are often disadvantaged and in an outer-city setting where children usually come from higher socioeconomic backgrounds; students teach in both settings, meet regularly with college counselors in small groups, participate in various field experiences, and attend workshops with cooperating teachers and administrators.

Oklahoma College of Liberal Arts
Chickasha, Oklahoma

After two years of self-study by the college, the programs of Inter-Disciplinary Studies and Independent Study were implemented; the programs, now known as IDS and IS, were two aspects of a general instituational change from the Oklahoma College for Women to the Oklahoma College for Liberal Arts.

Old Dominion University
Norfolk, Virginia

Integrating elementary school practicum with college methods courses, the program is a cooperative effort of a city school system and a university to improve the professional preservice education of future teachers; involved were 55 undergraduates, three university faculty, and 28 teachers from five elementary schools.

Oregon State University
Corvallis, Oregon

To develop a model for improved instruction in the schools and the university and to create a climate of change for students, teachers in training, teachers in service, administrators, and parents of pupils, the School of Education and the Corvallis school district have initiated a field-centered program; the prospective junior high teacher undergoes four training phases: tutor, teacher assistant, teacher associate, and intern teacher.

Plymouth State College of the University of New Hampshire
Plymouth, New Hampshire

The Cooperative College-School Elementary Science Program was implemented to stimulate New Hampshire school districts into modernizing their elementary school science offerings by using this model program and to update preparation of elementary science teachers in the state; the institute is a joint venture for the college, the State Department of Education, and the seven school boards, teachers, and administrative personnel of New Hampshire School Supervisory Union 48.

Prairie View Agricultural and Mechanical College
Prairie View, Texas

Noting that nonwhite children were learning to read and understand American life from books which barely mentioned minority lifestyles, the Multi-Ethnic Curriculum Program at the college constructed materials to correct this situation; the results have helped the students to read and understand different cultures with a minimum of personal bias.

Rhode Island College
Providence, Rhode Island

Primarily a training ground for the college's graduate and undergraduate students in clinical, laboratory, and internship experiences, the Learning Center also serves communities in Rhode Island and nearby Massachusetts in diagnostic and remediation services for children with psychoeducational problems; senior staff members and graduate students work in psychology, special education, elementary education, counseling, and social work.

St. John's University
Jamaica, New York

Defining a catalyst as a person who accelerates the occurrence of positive educational change, the university has set up its Educational Catalyst Program to provide selected teachers with the expertise to diagnose, analyze, evaluate, plan, coordinate, initiate, and nurture into existence approaches to educational innovation which are creative.

Seattle Pacific College
Seattle, Washington

The year-long, paid internship for students preparing for initial certification has evolved out of a combination of these promising trends in teacher education: (1) teacher education centers, (2) team teaching and differentiated staffing, (3) a consortium of college, school organization, and professional association of instruction, and (4) the concept of the paid internship.

Seton Hall University
South Orange, New Jersey

When the Newark public schools, after a long teachers strike, asked the university to help meet the continuing crisis in urban education, Seton Hall began an innovative six-week program which has evolved into a year-round project; 36 prospective high school teachers and 125 elementary teachers, helped by 10 clinical professors, determined achievement levels, detected health difficulties, planned materials and methods, instructed, counseled, and evaluated.

Southeastern Louisiana University
Hammond, Louisiana

To blend the theoretical with the practical and to provide secondary teacher trainees with more practice, the Coordinated Block Approach for the teaching of methodology was developed; included in its experiences are formulation of instructional goals, establishment of criteria for achieving formulated instructional goals, construction of successful patterns for classroom, relevant group and individualized instruction, and measurement of achievement.

Southwest Minnesota State College
Marshall, Minnesota

The new college's teacher education program of block credits emphasizes the components of competency-based performance, individualization, field orientation, systems analysis, and human relations; the student has principal responsibility for planning his learning program.

State University of New York College at Buffalo
Buffalo, New York

The college's Toward Personalized Teaching in Two-Year Colleges graduate program, begun with an HEW grant, involves four experimental features for the participating Fellow: (1) an advisement committee of three professors, (2) a six-week summer institute, (3) a two-semester professional-academic seminar, and (4) a semester's internship in a two-year college.

Temple Buell College
Denver, Colorado

Taking the position that varied and contradictory philosophies can often hamper more than help, the college has created a teacher education program reflecting a single consistent philosophic position; objectives for each course are prepared in behavioral terms, and the student is able, through course experience, to use techniques and methods for actual classroom practice.

Texas Christian University
Fort Worth, Texas

Through cooperation with The Pennsylvania State University and the State University of New York College at Geneseo, a first working paradigm for teacher education and the study of teaching was done; at present a pilot group of students is interacting with the instructional program.

The College of Emporia
Emporia, Kansas

For more efficient utilization of staff, greater opportunity of students to apply learning to real-life situations, and a more appealing teacher education experience, the program has replaced its traditional courses with 40 competences which are represented by one or more learning packages—behavioral objectives, selected readings, slide-illustrated and taped lectures, self-tests, and other media—which the student uses in the Self-Learning Laboratory.

The George Washington University
Washington, D. C.

Speaking to the need of richer experiences for young educational leaders, the university program has a closely supervised practicum in which 10 Fellows work in the field with new teachers, parent groups, the courts, and the press to gain interpersonal skills along with psychological and sociological insights.

The University of Arizona
Tucson, Arizona

The Professional Semester Program—an intensive student teaching experience in six secondary public schools serving multicultural populations run cooperatively by the Tucson public schools and The University of Arizona's College of Education—is built around prospective teachers studying methodology while apprenticed to teaching teams, during which they observe and teach full time for one semester.

The University of Wyoming
Laramie, Wyoming

Under an HEW-sponsored fellowship program, the university has launched the Education Specialist (Engineering Option) Program to train engineering teachers for community colleges, leading to an Education Specialist's degree in Curriculum and Instruction.

Trenton State College
Trenton, New Jersey

Student teachers are wrenched from the college refuge and thrust into the sights and sounds of an elementary school where they must cope with a myriad of problems; the student plays a progression of roles as observer, aide, assistant, and teacher and the college faculty also leaves its ivory tower, assuming responsibility for planning, implementing, evaluating, and financing the project center.

University of Georgia
Athens, Georgia

Sophomores, juniors, and seniors are given early and continual preservice interaction with public school students by participating, at each academic level, for a quarter in a school under the supervision of a center coordinator from the Division of Elementary Education staff and instructors of methods courses from the College of Education itself; 13 schools in Clarke, Oconee, and Oglethorpe counties serve as field centers.

University of Houston
Houston, Texas

Sixty-four students at the Houston Competency-Based Teacher Center are engaged in a preparation program which is competency-based, personalized, designed through systemic procedures, regenerative, field- and campus-centered, consortium-structured, and flexible in program and organization; program emphasizes human behavior, teaching styles, and decision making.

University of Maine at Farmington
Farmington, Maine

Responding to a need for trained personnel to work with high risk students entering college under the Program of Basic Studies (P.B.S.) as well as reflecting the desire of the Education Division for extended and earlier teaching experiences, the university began a special teacher training component that utilizes workshops, seminars, and training labs to prepare the student.

University of New Hampshire
Durham, New Hampshire

The Graduate Program for Specialists in Early Childhood Education involves the university with the state departments of education in Maine, New Hampshire, and Vermont as well as local school districts in these three states; assisted by an instructional aide, teams of two graduate students design, establish, and staff multi-age early childhood learning centers in local school districts.

University of Northern Colorado
Greeley, Colorado

Designed to give prospective teachers the chance to go into inner-city communities beyond the actual teaching situation, the program features a 10-day camping trip into the Southwest, visits to Indian and Hispano schools and communities, a six-week live-in in a minority community, and work with schools and community agencies.

University of Wisconsin—Eau Claire
Eau Claire, Wisconsin

A consortium by the university, the Wisconsin Research and Development Center for Cognitive Learning, the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction, and 14 schools in eight public school systems in the state has encouraged educational change within both the university and the school systems and has brought improved in-service programs.

University of Wisconsin—La Crosse
La Crosse, Wisconsin

The college has evolved a Nuclear Design for Teacher Education to establish a stronger bond between the College of Education and cooperating schools of the area; two units—Education and Resource Centers and the Center for Education Professions—further the effort to effect change in preservice and clinical experiences.

University of Wisconsin, Oshkosh
Oshkosh, Wisconsin

Four years ago, the university reexamined its clinical designs and began Project LINIS (Limited Non-Isolated Instructional Segments) to avoid the costly setup of a noncampus setting but offer a Teaching-Learning Clinic for development of a model which can be duplicated in cooperating communities.

University of Wisconsin—Stevens Point
Stevens Point, Wisconsin

Emphasizing prestudent teaching laboratory experiences, the Children's Motor Development Program gives university students the chance to study learning patterns of children along with all types of motor development; teacher and child work together on the child's individual needs for an entire semester, and evaluation sessions for the staff are held weekly.

University of Wisconsin—Whitewater
Whitewater, Wisconsin

To increase practicum experiences for elementary students minoring in Outdoor Education and to reduce the pupil-teacher ratio in the public schools, the College of Education has collaborated with the Milwaukee public schools on a series of two and one-half day resident camp outdoor education programs; prospective teachers can observe and evaluate individual abilities and cultural expectation.

West Chester State College
West Chester, Pennsylvania

In celebration of its 100th year of service to the teaching profession, the college is presenting nine Coffee Hours, sponsored by the Office of Student Teaching, for discussion of contemporary trends in the profession; invited are student teachers, classroom teachers, cooperating teachers, supervisors, college instructors, and interested personnel.

West Georgia College
Carrollton, Georgia

To avoid the pitfall of a teacher often teaching as he was taught, the college's teacher training block is organized into four clusters that catalog the needs of the learner: the experience sequence, examination of self, media skills, and integral concepts; full use is made of microteaching, on-site mini-lessons, and extended experiences.

Western Illinois University
Macomb, Illinois

An experimental model planned jointly by the university, school district, and Peoria Heights community, the project places the university student into a teaching team that employs a learning loop, including diagnosis, prescription, consignment, treatment and assessment, and individualized instruction.

Westmar College
Le Mars, Iowa

Convinced that teachers cannot be taught to teach in a structured course situation, the Education Department unstructured its professional semester by eliminating traditional courses, course credits and letter grades and setting up two eight-week blocks of time, granting eight credits each on a pass/fail basis; the first part concentrates on individual and group instruction and the second half offers full-time student teaching in area schools.

Westminster College
New Wilmington, Pennsylvania

As part of Project PEERS, Westminster students live in Philadelphia with black families, serve as instructional aides and tutors, and are involved in community programs; at the same time, Philadelphia high school students experience college life and studies, completing an exchange of educational enrichment.

Wheeling College
Wheeling, West Virginia

The program prepares students to become master teachers by concentrating on three relat[illegible]es: (1) person, (2) college-school partnership, and (3) perform[illegible] Wheeling feels that the s[illegible] of a liberal arts college can be [illegible] advantage in developing individualized programs

Wichita State University
Wichita, Kansas

The Community Education Center, cooperatively run by the university and the Wichita public schools, features a Reading Center program in which tutors are assisted by the professional staffs from the university and the public schools; a wide selection of reading materials is available to the university student through the pooling of resources.

Youngstown State University
Youngstown, Ohio

The Sheridan Project, a cooperative effort of the university and the Youngstown public school system, combines elements of (1) joint campus and city-school planning, (2) faculty participation in teaching methods courses within a clinical setting, (3) involvement of elementary education juniors for 25-30 hours weekly in school settings, and (4) integration of theory, method, and clinical practice in a performance-objectives mode.

Annual Meeting
1972

Beyond the Upheaval

The Thirteenth
Charles W. Hunt Lecture
Edward C. Pomeroy
Executive Director, AACTE

We have been fighting the battles of teacher education, one at a time, for so long, we sometimes tend to overlook the terrain we have covered. But I have not come here to recount the accomplishments we have logged in the past twenty years of my involvement, just to survey a bit, and maybe to map the next battles.

We teacher educators have been under pressure to supply more and more for so long, we sometimes forgot what it was we were supplying more and more of. But despite all our gains, teacher education is still embattled. Why is this?

The education of teachers continues to be an issue of importance; the teacher as motivator of students, as planner of studies, and as guide for the future remains the critical element in the success of every great educational enterprise. Is it so surprising, then, that we are at odds about how best to prepare him? The role of the teacher changes as new insights into learning are gained, as new research and innovative programs become operational, and as differing needs of society become apparent, but the value of teachers qualified to perform their roles with students remains a constant.

Since the preparation of teachers is a continuing necessity from one educational innovation to the next, teacher education must be seen as a future-oriented undertaking. It is a field of activity that deals with change, modifies itself by change, and flourishes through change. We are, in fact, a profession of change.

In focussing my own thinking, I have identified some six major crests in the upheaval in teacher education during the twenty years following World War II. I would characterize as of lasting importance the following:

1. Identification of teacher education as an appropriate and important function for all types of higher education institutions and not just for specialized institutions
2. Structuring of a national association of higher education institutions committed to improving teacher education, supported by cooperative institutional initiative and administered by professional staff
3. Acceptance of the shared responsibility for teacher education by higher education, teachers, and the lay public, as evidenced by a broadly based accreditation program
4. Development of a cadre of professionals equipped by training and experience to meet the expanded demands of teacher preparation
5. Joining together by academicians and pedagogues in cooperative approaches to meet the needs of prospective teachers
6. And lastly, expansion of governmental involvement in teacher education, particularly at the federal level, with all its new opportunities and resources as well as new problems.

Teacher education during this period,

while essentially an exclusive function of higher education, was one that is not even now fully developed on college and university campuses. The late 1940's witnessed the gradual recognition of the fact that preparing teachers is a vital undertaking requiring wide-based planning and the employment of the resources of all contributing institutions and organizations. Breaking away from the concept of teacher preparation as the prerogative of narrowly based and frequently poorly supported normal schools and teachers' colleges was a fundamental change that has had great meaning for our schools and our profession. Charles Hunt, in his report as secretary of the American Association of Teachers Colleges for 1947, demonstrated the direction of his leadership when he wrote:

> We prepare teachers for the common schools. If we include all that rightly falls under that heading, in the years ahead we shall have the kind of quality professional school to serve the students and the community that has not yet been seen on this continent. To build that school is our job. No one else will do it, either in the quality or quantity required. How can we do it? I know of campuses where there are promising beginnings. But we shall none of us get there so well by ourselves. Association is necessary. What kind shall it be?[1]

Teacher educators took up Dr. Hunt's challenge to broaden their professional association twenty-five years ago. In 1948 the National Association of Colleges and Departments of Education and the National Association of Teacher Education Institutions in Metropolitan Districts joined with the American Association of Teachers Colleges to form the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.[2] The same year saw the establishment of the Committee on the Coordination of Collegiate Problems in Teacher Education, which included the Association of Student Teaching, the National Society of Professors of Education, and the American Association of Teachers Colleges. The publication by AATC in 1948 of *School and Community Laboratory Experiences* [3] made tangible the close working relationship between ATE and AACTE, as we now know them. The publication also marked a high point in our professional literature, recognizing as it did the special value of the relationship between the school and the college in the task of preparing teachers. That notion is still central to teacher education today.

The year 1948 also saw the employment of the first full-time, professionally prepared staff member by AACTE, Dr. Warren Lovinger. This marked a first step toward providing professional leadership and management in coordinating AACTE's cooperative approach to the development of teacher education.

In the fall of 1951, when I joined the Association's staff, the membership of AACTE numbered 256 colleges and universities. An ambitious program of visitation was about to get underway. This effort focussed on the application of standards for teacher education which had been studied and revised with wide involvement and great care after the associational merger. These standards were developed as criteria for evaluation of collegiate institutions by the AATC. They provided all types of collegiate institutions with a common experience which would make possible a unified national association. At the same time, evaluations based on these criteria proved to be useful guides for the public in identifying programs of teacher education of high quality.

Ways and means were also being sought to involve practicing teachers in evaluating the effectiveness of teacher education. Discussions, spurred by NCTEPS of the National Education Association, eventually led to the establishment of the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education in 1953, but not without lengthy debate and negotiation. Thus, a widened base for evaluating teacher education became a reality in 1954, when the new Council took over accreditation responsibilities from AACTE. The early days of the Council were marked by hard work and bitter debate. Not until the mid-1960's could teacher educators feel assured of the Council's viability.

Teacher education grew in significance and strength because of NCATE. First, it made teacher education felt in the halls of higher education. When the National Commission on Accrediting officially recognized NCATE as the agency to evaluate collegiate teacher education, the program's stature had been established. Second, the principle of shared responsibility for the education of teachers was officially established, even though the role of the practicing teacher was at first a modest one. Third, the lay public as a concerned and contributing partner was clearly acknowledged. While it is true that the actual role of the National School Boards—representing the consumers of education—has not yet been of critical significance, the principle of their involvement has been established.

Since 1954 cooperative efforts in accreditation have provided the major, nationally visible relationship between the organized teaching profession and the colleges and universities; in the future it will be of increasing importance.

For AACTE the transfer of accreditation responsibilities opened up new avenues of service. Released from its role as an evaluatory agency, AACTE plunged into the task of stimulating improvement in collegiate teacher education programs. Higher education staffs were quick to grasp the opportunity provided by the national organization for cooperative efforts to improve their offerings. In the decade from 1954 to 1964 the number of collegiate institutions which joined in this national effort more than doubled. With the bitter accreditation disputes of the 1950's behind them, colleges and universities joined hands in the common cause of teacher education. The coalition of institutions that evolved is unique in American higher education. In no other national effort, either before or since, have so many kinds of institutions of higher education—big and small, rich and poor, prestigious and developing, public and private, secular and religious—institutions serving all segments of America's diverse populations, come together for a common purpose in such substantial numbers. This movement built itself on individual institutional initiative with little outside support. It is my belief that teacher education has contributed uniquely to welding together a higher education system in America. The colleges and universities, the organizations and agencies which were involved in this critical period in our educational history were animated by men and women of exceptional leadership and professional competence. Many of us here have worked hand in hand to implement the forward-looking movements of these past years. It has been an "all hands" task for professional commitment.

It would be easy to gloss over the heated debates between the academicians and the so-called "professional" educators. All too frequently there were misunderstandings, jealousies, and competition, triggered by the growing impact of accreditation and teacher preparatory programs. James Conant reported he had much to criticize strongly on both sides of the fence that separates faculties of education from those of arts and sciences.[4] Obviously, without the resources of each field's professional competence, without the cooperation and integration of these fields, effective teacher education is impossible.

Efforts by the National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards helped to reconcile the differing positions, spurred on by the elementary and secondary school teachers' desire for educational change. T. M. Stinnett reported that teachers

> . . . began to sense that there were great resources among the scholars in the various disciplines which would greatly strengthen the drive for revision and refinement. And most significant of all, they came to believe that for the first time these scholarly groups were really interested in helping.[5]

Constructive efforts to build bridges between these widely differing positions became more frequent in the 1960's. Campus discussions, regional workshops, and national conventions provided forums for all to participate in.

In 1964 the AACTE moved to include representation of academic faculties when it expanded the number of official institutional representatives from one to three and asked that at least one represent a "teaching" field.

Another key element in teacher education has been the role of state governments. State certification officers, organized in the National

Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification (NASDTEC), have been increasingly concerned with the quality of college and university programs of teacher education. The important role of state departments of education was recognized in the restructuring of national accreditation through NCATE.

The entry of the federal government on the scene provided a new and critically important element in teacher education. The National Defense Education Act, the Higher Education Act, and the Education Professions Development Act have had a very great impact. What began as a source of new funding for research and study has been responsible for setting new sights for all of us. Federally funded programs, such as Graduate Fellowships for Experienced School Personnel, Regional Educational Laboratories, and Educational Resources Information Centers (ERIC), have stimulated new approaches to problems of education. Federal involvement has turned the nation's focus on such special educational problems as the urban schools and the needs of the disadvantaged young.

In *Teachers for the Real World* B. Othanel Smith wrote:

> Teacher education is at a critical point in history. There is now enough knowledge and experience to reform it, to plan a basic program of teacher education for an open society in time of upheaval. But if this knowledge and experience are dissipated in prolonged discussions of issues, doctrines, and tenets leading only to more dialogue, instead of a fundamental program of education for the nation's teachers, teacher education is likely to fragment and its pieces drift in all directions.[6]

Federal accomplishments were, and continue to be, of vital importance in the renewal of teacher education. Edwin P. Adkins correctly identified its significance in 1966:

> . . . it seems clear that a new establishment has been, or is in the process of being born; and this new establishment is located at the federal level, with billions to spend, and the political power to make ideas stick . . . At this point I am neither condemning nor praising; I am merely saying that the new establishment is there and that we must deal with it.[7]

The federal government's role looms increasingly large in the future of teacher education. The specific developments I have cited occurred in the context of the social and economic upheaval following World War II. They had great impact on education and, as we have noted, on teacher education. The moment had arrived when "the flux was in full flow"; actions and accomplishments were realized during that period that have far-reaching implications for tomorrow's developments in teacher education.

Before examining with you the possible developments of the future and the goals we might reasonably set ourselves for shaping those developments, let me recapitulate. In seeing how far we have come, before noting how far we must still go, I have identified six crests of the upheaval through which we have passed in the last twenty or more years. As a result of these upheavals:

- Teacher education is now firmly identified as the proper business of all types of institutions of higher learning.
- A professionally administered structure has been born out of cooperative institutional initiative to channel the desire of these institutions to improve teacher education.
- A broadly based accreditation program recognizes the shared responsibility of higher education, teachers, and the public for the improvement of teacher education.
- A cadre of professionals is now equipped by training and experience to meet the expanded demands of teacher preparation.
- Progress in the joining together of academicians and pedagogues to meet the needs of prospective teachers has been effected.
- And, lastly, expanded governmental involvement, particularly on the federal level, is here to stay, bringing with it additional resources, new opportunities, and, yes, new problems.

These developments did not take place in a vacuum. Everything around us was changing and so was teacher education. The *rapidity of change* was startling even to those students of society and technology who had been speaking so cogently and for so long about its omnipresence. This was true in all fields, not just education. The swelling population made sore demands on the supply of teachers. The need to catch up with the demands for more schools, more educational opportunity, and thus more trained personnel, was pressed on us from the media, the public, the pulpit, the legislators. To respond while simultaneously undergoing vital internal changes, teacher education was called upon to go the "extra mile."

Our population had not only increased in size but had shifted its composition and location. Coupled with the growing urbanization of our nation went the realization that the fruits of American life are not available to all of our citizens, that many of our institutions, including our schools, are engaged in practices that are racist in nature.

The schools became the center of expectations and, then, of smouldering frustration. They were expected to provide upward social mobility for a restless youth in its search for a meaningful life. All of this, in a world of uncertainties. Everyone was looking for reassurance and direction for lives that had suddenly become unhooked. Teachers and teacher educators who, a few years before, had been struggling for some attention were finding themselves suddenly center stage. The call was loud and clear; schools were not meeting the needs of our urban communities; students were turned off by the irrelevance of curriculums earlier deemed acceptable. The demand for more stringent academic programs occasioned by Sputnik's success in 1957 was soon overshadowed by the growing demands of the disadvantaged for programs geared to their development as effective persons.

Our professional and personal lives have been a part of this change. We have felt its impact upon the educational mission to which we and those we represent have devoted our professional lives. We have witnessed the effects of these uncertainties and these frustrations on our families, our colleagues, our students, and ourselves.

Undoubtedly we live in one of the great revolutionary times in the history of the world. Education—the development of people and the cooperative approach to solve personal as well as national and international problems—would seem to be the best hope of man as he recharts his course in the wake of upheaval. What can we as teacher educators do? What is our role and how are we to commit ourselves for tomorrow if our society is to renew itself? These are the questions for which we must have some answers, for we are the ones who have seen the light in a child's eyes when he responds to a skilled teacher. We know its importance.

Let us consider our responses.

As a beginning, let us not panic in the face of problems of the moment. If we are to provide long-range help in the reordering and renewing of education we have to squarely confront the complex issues and act rationally and effectively. *The past has proved we can.*

The oversupply of teachers and the tightening of budgets, coupled with demands for new approaches to the preparation of educational personnel, have eroded many an institution's depth of commitment to teacher education.

That such reviews are taking place is a matter of great importance. The future in teacher education is not going to be, tomorrow any more than it was yesterday, a field for the faint of heart. It is not for bandwagon riders. It is for people and institutions with potential for follow-through and the long pull.

Be visionary in goals of quality and effectiveness but be at the task of seeking the best roads to those goals. You who are here in Chicago this week are the valued core of professional men and women with the intellectual training and practical professional experience that constitute a great social and educational resource for our nation.

The current abundance of teachers—overall, but not in all fields—begs for the long look in teacher education. That there are more teachers in 1971 and 1972 than there are positions for them to fill points clearly to the convergence of many factors, not least of which is the revolt of the taxpayers in meeting the money demands for education. But let us not lose sight of our failure to read the signs in years past which were pointing to today's problem. The declining birthrate, the growing holding power of the teaching profession as a result of improved salaries and working conditions for teachers, and, above all, the increasing commitment of teachers to their careers as professional men and women, all have been part of the scene in education for a number of years. In most instances those of us in positions of leadership have not acted on the signals. The oversupply of the moment is likely to be a passing phenomenon as readjustments in education and the economy take place. Regrettable as it is, the lack of professional opportunities for beginning teachers marks an accomplishment for teacher education we have all been working for since the end of World War II. I mean, of course, a balance between the supply and demand of new teachers. We have been playing "catch up ball" for twenty years. With this sort of "game plan," is it any wonder that strategy and the formulation of new roles received scant attention?

It is my belief that we have reached a new plateau in the preparation of educational personnel in America today. This comes after a long, hard climb. We are at a period when we must quickly restage the available resources and move on.

Today, difficult as our problems may seem, we are much better prepared to proceed. Because of our past struggles, we know better what the future will demand. We know how to value forward-looking leadership; we have crafted organized mechanisms to meld our resources into a critical mass for effective action. We realize the value of research data that ties action to knowledge rather than to guesswork. Above all, because of the complexities of preparing teachers for a society emerging from a period of upheaval, we should realize the need to open up the process of preparation to new partners and new procedures.

This sounds like a big order and so it is. It is the kind of order that surely this body can take in stride. Where else can there be assembled such a group of professionals who have devoted their lives to preparing teachers? We know how difficult the task is. We know how hard it is to engage the interest and support of others not as directly involved in the day-to-day work of teacher education.

If we who are engaged in preparing personnel for the schools address the questions of the future with less than full certainty, we must yet do so with an air of confidence. We do not know all the answers, but certainly we should be about the exciting work, for we are in a field where solutions are to be found. Our future, the kind of teacher education needed for the schools of tomorrow, is ahead. Important work needs to be done by our institutions, our organizations, and ourselves. It can only be done by individuals with high morale and a strong belief that they have society's most important calling.

My purpose to now has been to shake out of our busy and complex profession half a dozen factors that are, in my view, important parts of our common base of experience and critical to the next steps in teacher education. I am counting on your identifying yourselves with my analysis—either in agreement or for future debate.

Beyond the upheaval that has so changed our traditional societal and professional ground rules, where do we professional teacher educators go from here? Certainly by this February 1972 we should be thoroughly shaken out of any semblance of complacency. For those too wedded to "the" way of preparing teachers or who find the pace too swift, the action in teacher education will soon pass them by. On the other hand, for those who have been looking forward to new visibility for our efforts and who have confidence in new configurations of study and experience, an exciting time is at hand. What exactly?

Let us consider some five targets for future professional action.

Greater involvement with actual school situations will most assuredly be a hallmark of organized teacher education programs of the future. Every effort to study this possibility brings an enthusiastic response from the prospective teacher. The opportunity to work closely with boys and girls in a real, live educational scene gives meaning to the preparatory program. It is an opportunity to check the theoretical discussions of the college and university classroom with the real world of the practicing teacher. It can either build confidence or help those students with marginal commitment decide that teaching is not for them.

Currently planned teacher renewal sites and teacher centers, the next national thrust of the U. S. Office of Education, build on the concept of utilizing the schools and the communities; these centers will serve as proper partners for colleges and universities. Together they can provide appropriate experiences in the education of teachers. Closely associated with the involvement of schools in teacher education is the concept of the career-long development of teachers. Faced with the lightning rapidity of professional and social change, teacher education can ill afford to see itself as a one-shot affair culminating in a baccalaureate degree. It suggests, moreover, that, increasingly, in-service education will be based on school and teacher needs rather than on arbitrary faculty decisions at a neighboring collegiate institution.

The developing concepts of the renewal site strategy are provocative ones and should challenge all of us in collegiate teacher education. The value of a direct laboratory component for teacher education has long been considered the heart of our programs. The new ingredients here are not only an increase in actual time devoted to such experience but the new responsibilities assumed by these schools and communities in tandem with the higher education faculties and institutions. Here is an opportunity for new resources for teacher education. Here are new variables that open up possibilities for new program configurations, for new flexibility. What we are moving toward, hopefully, is a new principle of parity among the colleges and universities, the schools and the community. This seems a logical and useful extension of measures already well documented to spread the base of participation in teacher education.

The consortium approach to teacher education, involving as it does schools, colleges, state departments of education, and communities, has been an innovation of forward-looking programs for some time. The Multi-institutional Student Teaching Center in Kanawha County, West Virginia, received the AACTE's Distinguished Achievement Award in 1970. This program, involving seven institutions of higher education, a county school system, the State Department of Education, the community, and professional organizations, provides a valuable prototype for the teaching center idea; another cooperative teacher center is in operation at the other end of the continent—a consortium headed up at Central Washington State College. Both exemplify a growing movement among AACTE member institutions around the nation. The federal government's support of this concept will bring new resources and visibility to cooperative planning and implementation of teacher education programs.

The ivied towers of our colleges have too long been identified as physically and philosophically removed from the "nitty gritty" of elementary and secondary school classroom problems. A working relationship between two agencies is proposed, both of which have significant contributions to make. College professors of methods and educational theory are going to be called upon to test and weigh their views in the market place of the classroom. Donald Arnstine puts it this way:

> Faculties who will not deal with the practical problems of teaching, learning, and growing up, and who avoid the places where these events occur, should not be in the business of teacher education.[8]

The way is opening up for the use of new resources to make the education of new teachers more meaningful and more directly associated with the schools, where the action is. The higher education community must assume its rightful role in this process. Too much experience and knowledge reside at the college level to bypass them in these discussions. The time is already late for effective input to the renewal plans from the college community, but indications are emerging which suggest an awareness of the need for balanced discussion of the development. Openness is required by all of us, and I am pleased to note that the leadership of AACTE has been working effectively on behalf of higher education's role to bring about a meaningful dialogue and a constructive, action-oriented approach.

A basic requirement for success in this development is communication between teachers, citizens, and professors. That calls for the involvement of higher education institutions in the towns and cities they serve. Colleges and universities need such involvement in all aspects of their curriculums. Teacher education can provide them with the door through which service to the community as well as support from constituencies can effectively pass in both directions.

Teachers in the schools today are our former students, honored graduates from our institutions. We have a personal and professional stake in their success. Yet, for the most part, we do not follow their careers, nor cycle back into our programs evaluations of their success or failure. These men and women, along with the parents of their pupils, make up the citizenry through whom societal and educational change can be realized. We should welcome the closer relationships proposed in teacher centers. Could it be that our oft-expressed interest in, and concern for, the schools and parents and their children is mere talk? I do not believe so. We have at hand a proposal to place our actions and not just our words on the line. We must not fail to take full advantage of that opportunity, we must not shortchange our ideals.

Educating teachers in close contact with the people they serve offers new opportunities to provide multicultural experiences for prospective school personnel. These assist our society in its deeper democratization.

The "melting pot" theory of society is no longer acceptable to a nation made up of diverse races, cultures, and ethnic origins. The teacher must not only be at home in his or her own cultural background but must be deeply sensitive to the varied cultural strains running through our society.

Where and how can prospective teachers obtain this knowledge and develop these understandings? Certainly the college and university provide a setting of freedom and scholarly resources of high importance. The institution of higher education needs, however, that "door into the community" for true multicultural education to flourish.

Once we fully accept the idea of collegiate-based teacher education with doors into and out of the communities served, think of the possibilities it points to for general as well as professional education. Think of its significance, beyond national boundaries, and of the benefits a multinational and multicultural approach would bring.

Closely associated with shared responsibility for teacher education is the promise implicit in performance-based teacher education. I identify this as our second target. Stimulated by study of a systems-approach to teacher education, performance-based programs require that the student

> . . . either be able to demonstrate his ability to promote desirable learning or exhibit behaviors known to promote it. He is held accountable, . . . the training institution is itself held accountable for producing able teachers. Emphasis is on demonstrated product or output.[9]

The revolutionary ideas in this approach to teacher education are a vital part of the newly revised accreditation standards for teacher education[10] and are consistent with closer relationships with the schools, teachers, and communities. There is pressure on all programs, whether collegiate-based or not, to answer the question: Does participation really make a difference in how the teacher handles his or her opportunity to teach boys and girls? If this is to be the direction of the future, we can see how important it is to know what happens in the classroom. It will require the use of research and evaluative techniques most college and university programs only talk about.

Performance-based teacher education, sporadic and scattered as it is, has the potential for restructuring the education of teachers. It bespeaks the emerging future and points the way for teacher education. A significant number of AACTE member colleges and universities have already committed their teacher education programs to performance-based goals and are now going all-out to forge a new approach to preparing teachers.

Inherent in all we have considered for the future is the call for better quality. Target three will settle for nothing less than excellence in the quality of the teacher education student and his preparation experience. Too frequently in the past we have been caught up in the pressure to turn out numbers and have compromised our need for the best.

There is a need for more information about teaching. What competencies do good teachers have? Once we can agree on what these are, we must debate how to assess whether our graduates possess them. A tall order. One of the intriguing aspects of the performance-based movement is that it will help search out answers. What the future will not tolerate is the waste of our human resources. The schools of tomorrow are going to demand a wide variety of knowledge, perspectives, and skills, and this squarely places on teacher education the responsibility to develop young men and women drawn from society's full range of economic, social, racial, and ethnic backgrounds.

As greater selectivity is practiced, it follows that programs of education and training will be more seriously evaluated by students, governing boards, the teaching profession, and the public at large. So-so courses and programs just won't do. Beyond the upheaval, nothing but well-planned and precisely executed programs will suffice. The writing on the wall is clear for all of us to see!

Along with our concern for preparation improvement goes a responsibility to champion exemplary teaching in our own programs. Much evidence exists that teachers tend to teach as they have been taught. With the present emphasis on the effectiveness of our graduates, can we do less than insist on quality performance by ourselves and our colleagues? How many of us have really heeded the recent research on teaching effectiveness, how many have applied the media as aids in our own teaching?

Teaching should be the stock in trade of every preparation program. In our continuing struggle to maintain prestige and influence within the institution we serve, can we do better than be recognized by student and colleague alike as *a good teacher?*

A faculty made up of good teachers who are students of teaching as well, becomes, in a sense, a teaching center within academia. The benefits of the interinvolvements that would surely ensue could give new strength and viability to baccalaureate education. They could enable teacher education to take a central position of service and leadership on the campus.

Closely associated with our long-time effort at quality control of preparation programs has been accreditation, our fourth target. Currently the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) is administering an influential program of evaluation of college and university efforts in teacher education. Probably more than in any other field of accreditation, time, effort, and financial resources are being directed to evaluating efforts based on the standards that all segments of the profession have contributed to in recent years. Nowhere is the complexity of the process of teacher preparation made as evident as it is in accreditation. The philosophical problems, the budgetary, political and educational problems, all come together in accreditation. It is a tribute to our profession and to the National Council that it has been able to serve the field and the current accredited listing of 498 colleges and universities.

Problems are appearing, however, that will warrant our careful attention in the time immediately ahead. In the first place, the entire concept of professional and institutional control of accreditation is being challenged.[10] The increasing amount of federal aid being made available to educational institutions and agencies demands that criteria be established to guide in its distribution. The federal government has identified accredited status as a useful device. The fact that accreditation was not devised for use in this way has not hindered the governmental involvement in accreditation. At the present time, however, because of accreditation's frequent inadequacy to handle tasks it was never intended to fulfill in the first place, there is serious pressure building up inside the federal bureaucracy for restructuring accreditation to give the government a more important role. This proposed move away from the traditional posture of the federal government, namely, avoidance of entanglements with control of education, offers the prospect of substantial problems not only for accreditation, but for all of higher education's time-honored efforts to govern itself.

Now governmental accreditation is a unique part of American education. It has been a valued part of our processes of governance and undoubtedly deserves careful consideration before it is summarily dismissed. We in teacher education who have committed so much to accreditation would seem to have a special responsibility in the determination of its future.

Several possible reforms of teacher education's accreditation and of NCATE seem worthy of consideration. They pose questions such as these:

- Is the current structure adequate in the light of widened participation in teacher preparatory programs? If the schools and the community are to be involved shouldn't their efforts be incorporated into the purview of the accrediting agency?
- Do the criteria used in evaluation discriminate sufficiently well between the good and the less worthy? Despite the advanced state of teacher education standards, there is still a lack of research data to allay all our concern.
- How does one judge performance of graduates? Here again the need for research is evident. While awaiting new data, we should be applying that which we already know, meager though it is.
- How is the effort to be financed? The resources of the current constituency of NCATE are already stretched to the breaking point. Either new sources of support or a new concept of the depth and frequency of evaluations seems indicated.

These are but a few of the questions now surfacing in relation to accreditation. Then there is the nagging thought that perhaps accreditation has already made its contribution to teacher education—that maybe our field is now sophisticated and disciplined enough to stimulate and control itself by other means and so free badly-needed resources for other more innovative and imaginative efforts.

Accreditation will persist as a problem in teacher education for the next decade, just as it has during the past quarter of a century. We need to take a new look at our perennial problem in light of the changes that are on the horizon. AACTE should take the initiative in establishing a task force to look broadly at the whole emerging field of teacher education and to chart a viable procedure for governance of future programs.

As we reviewed possible new directions for institutionalized programs of teacher preparation there has been an ingredient common to each of them—research. This is our fifth target. The preparation of teachers is not a field for armchair philosophers. We need to base ourselves on demonstrable evidence. We need an undergirding of research, one that can be instrumental in setting directions and evaluating results.

Its data and insights will not only help to meet the demand for a more effective accounting of our efforts in preparing teachers but will also provide new tools for curriculum planning.

Fortunately, the prototypes for future research are already at hand. Specialists in education research centers at colleges and universities are demonstrating the effective use of new techniques in planning and in the development of materials and program components for preparing personnel. At the heart of the researchers' approach to teacher education is the systems concept. This provides procedures for study and analysis which, in turn, enable the emerging programs to reflect changes which have been shown to be effective.

The Research and Development Center for Teacher Education at the University of Texas provides a valuable preview of the resources which the future must provide teacher education. At this center, a staff of research specialists, supplemented by support staff and the latest technical equipment, are evolving a new and exciting Personalized Teacher Education program. A theoretical approach to teacher preparation is being translated into a system of education which is being studied and analyzed as it develops. Fourteen colleges and universities of the AACTE membership are serving as experimental sites for one or more of the systems components.

The AACTE membership stands before the challenge to arrange cooperative approaches necessary to effectively conceptualize and carry out research-based developments in teacher education. While some institutions will have the capacity and resources to conduct the more sophisticated research, *all* will have the responsibility to understand, to utilize, and to experiment with the results. Whether it be Personalized Teacher Education or some other approach to our field, the researcher and his skill in analyzing and studying our programs will be essential components in teacher education programs of tomorrow.

Colleges and universities have an important role in organizing this needed research, much of which will, of necessity, be done in the field. Each institution is also going to need a caliber of research that is largely lacking at the present time. Data regarding the effectiveness of institutional programs are a must, as are efforts to maintain continuing contact with graduates in order to evaluate their success once they are in full-time school positions. The input of such data back into the system of teacher education will be a valuable tool to keep our programs sharp, useful, and in touch with school needs.

Continuing attention of scholars to the questions of teaching and learning will be a necessary and important reminder of what teacher education is all about – children and adults succeeding in learning new attitudes, new values, and new abilities by dint of a teacher's efforts.

As we think back over the issues and opportunities selected for emphasis here, it is clear that the job ahead is a big one. My basic assumption is that teachers are the critical agent in the educative process; further, that educational personnel can be trained to do their task; and that it is a challenge to each of us, in concert with our associates everywhere and with others perhaps yet unidentified, to work together to provide our nation with the professional leadership its schools need.

To do all this we need confidence in our own ability to renew ourselves and our institutions, agencies, and organizations in a way that will assure our fellow men that, beyond the upheaval of today, our children and our children's children will have the kind of teachers, schools, and education that will enable them to face future societal upheavals with assurance.

Notes

(1) Hunt, Charles W. Secretary's Report, *1947 Yearbook*. Oneonta, N.Y.: AATC.

(2) Cottrell, Donald P., Editor. *Teacher Education for a Free People*. Oneonta, N.Y.: AACTE, 1956. p. 4.

(3) Flowers, John G., Stratemeyer, Florence B., Patterson, Allen D., and Lindsey, Margaret. *School and Community Laboratory Experiences*. Oneonta, N.Y.: AATC, 1948.

(4) Conant, James B. *The Education of American Teachers*. New York, N.Y.: McGraw-Hill, 1961. p. 13.

(5) Hodenfield, G. K., and Stinnett, T. M. *The Education of Teachers*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1961. p. 16.

(6) Smith, B. Othanel, Editor. *Teachers for the Real World*. Washington, D. C.: AACTE, 1969. p. *ix*.

(7) *Frontiers in Teacher Education, 19th Yearbook*. Washington, D. C.: AACTE, 1966. p. 29.

(8) Arnstine, Donald. *The Humanistic Foundations in Teacher Education*. Washington, D. C.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, 1972. p. 49.

(9) Elam, Stanley. *Performance-Based Teacher Education: What Is the State of the Art?* Washington, D. C.: AACTE, 1971. pp. 1-2.

(10) *Recommended Standards for Teacher Education*. Washington, D. C.: AACTE, 1971.

(11) Collins, Evan R. *The Impossible Imperatives: Power, Authority, and Decision Making in Teacher Education*, 12th Charles W. Hunt Lecture. Washington, D. C.: AACTE, 1971.

The Hunt Lectures

1960—The Dimensions of Professional
Leadership
Laurence DeFee Haskew

1961—Revolution in Instruction
Lindley P. Stiles

1962—Imperatives for Excellence in
Teacher Education
J. W. Maucker

1963—Africa, Teacher Education, and
the United States
Karl W. Bigelow

1964—The Certification of Teachers:
The Restricted State Approved
Program Approach
James B. Conant

1965—Perspective on Action in
Teacher Education
Florence B. Stratemeyer

1966—Leadership for Intellectual
Freedom in Higher Education
Willard B. Spalding

1967—Tradition and Innovation in
Teacher Education
Rev. Charles F. Donovan, S. J.

1968—Teachers: The Need and the Task
Felix C. Robb

1969—A Consumer's Hopes and
Dreams for Teacher Education
Elizabeth D. Koontz

1970—Realignments for Teacher
Education
Fred T. Wilhelms

1971—The Impossible Imperatives:
Power, Authority, and Decision
Making in Teacher Education
Evan R. Collins

Policy and Decision Making In Teacher Education

Mark Smith
Associate Professor of
Secondary Education
The University of Arizona
Chairman of the Session

CHAIRMAN SMITH: I would like to give you a little background for this session. The former AACTE Committee on Studies had a subcommittee which was devoted to policy making and implementation. This subcommittee operated for a little over two years and had many deep concerns about the whole area of policy making and decision making in the teacher education function on the university campuses. It addressed itself to a number of questions, and I would like to give you an example of the types of things it was concerned about.

The subcommittee members wanted to address themselves to the question of who is making policy with regard to teacher education programs—both those agencies that are direct influence agencies as well as those that are indirect. They wanted to know just what is meant by accountability, to whom teacher education is to be accountable, and for what. They wanted to know the difference between being responsible to an agency that has an interest in teacher education and being responsive to an agency that had such an interest, and to which type of agency you address which emphasis. They were interested in the whole question of parity and where it fits into the teacher education picture.

They began to draw some assumptions in their deliberations. For example, they made the assumption that the issue of legitimization of direction of teacher education is a crucial issue today, and that we face serious problems because of the lack of direction at this time.

They were very concerned that in the past, teacher education has often made decisions because of pressures from somebody else, either outside the university or on the university campus. They felt we must begin to take a stance on the basis of the best professional thoughts available to us, rather than on the basis of pressures which are brought to bear.

They felt that professional education is disadvantaged on the university campus because it has no model of what a professional school, which is preparing teachers and other educational personnel, ought to be. At the same time they felt that teacher education is on its knees in relationship with the rest of the university, and they found this a rather compromising position—not a very good position from which to fight.

This gives you some idea of the kinds of questions and the issues to which the subcommittee addressed itself. The members decided that they would go to work and come up with some kind of suggestion for solution of such problems and issues, by asking some people to take segments of the whole area of policy and decision making and write position papers on them. They divided this up, and three gentlemen took on the task with the help of the ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, which commissioned the papers. Those three gentlemen are the three who are on the platform with me here this afternoon.

They decided they wanted to get some help, and so a year ago at this time, at the AACTE Annual Meeting, we had an all-day clinic at which the three writers presented their ideas and gave those who attended an opportunity to react. These three writers are Paul G. Bulger, State University of New York at Albany; Robert B. Howsam, University of Houston; and Francis J. Pilecki, Labouré Junior College, Boston. From that input, they went back and put together the papers, which have been submitted to ERIC and which are now available.

We decided that today we would like to share some of these ideas with you and get your reactions. We would like to stir up some interest and perhaps different points of view in the process. In terms of the concurrent sessions that you attended this morning, remember that you were dealing with a number of issues, such as state legislation with regard to certification and licensure, or performance-based teacher education, or the new educational rules. We hope that you will think of those issues in terms of the kinds of ideas they present, and then we hope you will do the same thing with regard to the concurrent sessions that will follow this afternoon.

The issues which were used as a basis for the concurrent sessions this morning are current concerns in teacher education. Looking at the list, such as educational renewal sites, teacher centers, and so on, Dr. Howsam, would you pursue how you think these relate to what we are going to be talking about this afternoon?

HOWSAM: It is our opinion that each of these are legitimate social issues, but it is our belief that underlying every one of the current solutions being proposed to the problems of the allocation of responsibilities for the policy making and control of education within the society are certain assumptions about control. It is our belief that before it is safe to proceed with the solution of any of these, that we ought to address ourselves to the fundamental question of who the teacher education profession is, and what teacher education is in relation to that profession, and what the proper roles and responsibilities are of the different kinds of parties. All of this should be done in a conceptual framework in order that each time we address one of the basic questions, we know what the fundamental issues are and we take care to preserve our proper role in the process of doing that.

CHAIRMAN SMITH: You raise the question of the profession. At the clinic last year, we addressed ourselves to the question of what the profession is. And it was asked, "Isn't that a rather trite question to be asking of a group such as this?" But in the course of that day it became apparent that we've got to be pretty well agreed on a definition of a profession if we are going to be able to pursue the other ideas that follow.

So with that in mind, Dr. Bulger, would you explore for us and clarify the idea of the profession?

BULGER: I'll certainly try. Considering the question, "What is a profession?"—every occupation has a set of criteria by which relative success or failure is determined. When an occupation bases success upon the betterment of society, or if the major motive for entering that particular field of endeavor involves the betterment of mankind, we may term that occupation a "public service" vocation. Then within this group, a few fields exhibit a unique and highly specialized area of service, as well as high-level intellectual specializations and operational skills. Then from this second category of occupations emerges a third, minute group of fields upon which society depends for some of its vital services and for which society holds great respect. Society is willing to pay relatively high prices for these field services. The third group, at the top of our occupational hierarchy, may be called professional. Following the above guidelines, therefore, some occupations do qualify as professions.

Although virtually every author who has written on the subject of professionalism has attempted to define this elusive concept, no precise measurement exists for determining exactly which occupations may be termed professions and which occupations may not. Rather, professions exhibit, to varying degrees, a number of characteristics. It is generally agreed that in order to be a profession, an occupation demands the following of its members:

1. Mastery of an esoteric body of knowledge: members of a profession must be in sole possession of their field's subject area;

2. Rigorous academic preparation: a profession's members must undergo prolonged, specialized training in order to perform competently;

3. Provision of specialized services: a profession's services must be unique and vital;

4. Judgment and evaluation of and by one's peers: there must be the means of direct regulation of a profession's standards, membership, and responsibilities;

5. Maintenance of high ethical standards: a profession must have the ability to enforce the ethical conduct of its members;

6. Certain degree of autonomy: the individual and the entire profession must enjoy certain liberties and self-regulation; and

7. High public esteem: members of a profession must be highly respected members of society.

Since all professions exhibit the above characteristics to different extents, it follows that some professions may be more "professional" than others. In other words, no profession rates a perfect score for each characteristic. Rather, each may be said to approach an ideal concept of professionalism. The occupations closest to this ideal are termed professions. Difficulty arises, however, in an arbitrary cutoff point, above which an occupation is termed a profession and below which an occupation is assumed to be something less than a true profession.

Then if you turn from this general statement and listing of seven characteristics, and you perhaps can add more, there are many who, for a variety of reasons, insist that various educational occupations cannot be considered professions. Some say that so many teachers lack requisite skills that teaching may not be termed a profession. Others say that too many teachers entered the field by accident or "chose the easy way out" and did not give enough thought to their choice of a professional career. Still others argue that teachers are not held in high enough public esteem to be considered professionals because so many of them nowadays participate in strikes and work stoppages, and you know how you can add to this story.

While the above arguments are more or less true, and, for some people, indicate that the field of education may be somewhat less professional than other professions, it does not follow in my judgment that education must be considered a highly skilled public service occupation and not on the level of categories we mentioned before. The field of education does exhibit each of the seven professional characteristics to some degree. The question thus arises, does the field of education exhibit these characteristics strongly enough to be considered a true profession?

Since we noted before that there is no arbitrary cutoff point that exists for determining a profession, it might be helpful to add a few criteria to our list of characteristics in order to answer the question. And I submit to you that there is a uniqueness to education that necessitates a different approach to the problem. Education differs from other, more traditional professions in some ways. We are a young profession. Education is much lower on the professional evolutionary scale than such established professions as medicine and law. Medicine is said to have become a profession in the 18th century after "William and John Hunter subordinated surgical skill to diagnostic knowledge and informed judgments." The formation of the American Medical Association in 1846 and the subsequent adoption of a professional code of ethics further strengthened the professionalization of the medical field. Likewise, law was well on its way to becoming a profession in the United States with the formation of the American Bar Association in 1854. The acceptance of the Canons of Professional Ethics in 1908 provided for a true legal profession, according to the American Bar Association's own analysis. The field of education lacked a code of ethics, high public esteem, and rigorous professional training well after medicine and law had become professions.

Then we have the whole matter of stratification in our own field of education, further fragmented by a diverse training program.

Then we have what some people categorize as employee studies. While many members of other professional groups are self-employed and nearly completely autonomous, educators are normally employees of an institution, a school district, or a governmental agency. Educators are somewhat more subject to state and local control than members of the established professions.

But along with these points, and they all stress the uniqueness of our situation in the education profession, I would like to add two characteristics to the seven that are fairly common to all professions and submit them for your consideration as fundamental to our business of education as a profession.

The first concept is that of idealism, and it is found, as many of us know, in vast quantities within the field of education. Perhaps the most important standard of all in judging whether a vocation can be considered a true profession is this idea of idealism. The teacher who enters the field to work with children, the school administrator who continually passes up new jobs offering higher salaries because he has not completed the task at hand, and the college professor who spends many evenings per week counseling his students all illustrate this spirit of idealism that is so prevalent in the field of education. This extreme dedication to public service, without the enjoyment of high salary or public recognition, qualifies the field of education for professional status.

The second point that I would like to add that is common to the learned professions is that professional lives should be governed by a basic principle which gives impetus to the thinking and activities of the members of a profession. The legal profession provides an excellent example of this basic premise. The principle of due process guarantees every human being certain legal rights and privileges that can never be compromised. The medical profession provides us with another, more fundamental principle: life is preferable to death. And here is what I think we are dealing with that makes us a true profession; education has perhaps an even more basic premise: knowledge is preferable to ignorance. This premise has also been stated by Thomas Hamilton in 1959 in the state of New York. He put it this way, "Truth is always preferable to error." This basic principle I think undergirds our whole concept of education as a profession and makes us a true profession.

The field of education tends to exhibit the traditional characteristics of a profession as well as the two additional characteristics of idealism and a basic professional premise. When one also considers rising teacher salaries, the growing number of master's degrees held by teachers, and the increasing status of educators, it seems inappropriate to consider education anything less than a true profession.

Part of our job as teacher educators is to have faith in ourselves and in education as a profession. We need to reflect in our daily lives this conviction as we go about the business of making policy decisions in teacher education. Deep down we need to really accept and promote teaching as a profession and to make every effort to continue to make it a reality.

I submit that as a background for a more practical approach to this problem.

CHAIRMAN SMITH: Dr. Howsam, you have developed a model which was tested at last year's clinic and at a couple of other meetings, and which has been given support by the Subcommittee on Policy Making and Implementation.

Would you give us the essential features of that model?

HOWSAM: My share of the presentation addresses itself to two major concerns. First, the organizational relationship for teacher education within the college or university framework. Secondly, the organization and control patterns for teacher education within the broader field of relationships with other professional schools and governmental organizations and agencies.

It is the thesis of my paper that:

1. Education generally and teacher education in particular are disadvantaged by faulty governance systems and structures, as well as the imprecise self-definition of who and what we are.

2. Many of the problems of education stem directly, or indirectly, from these faulty structures.

3. There is an urgent need for whole new sets of assumptions about the governance of education and teacher education.

In this presentation, two of these positions are to be explored. Admittedly, the treatment has to be somewhat sketchy.

First I would like to examine the position of teacher education within the university structure.

Modern colleges and universities in almost all cases are elaborate and complex. This recognition led Clark Kerr some years ago to refer to the modern university as the multiversity. Complex organizations are made up of many smaller organizations. An organizational sociologist who was totally unfamiliar with our institutions would quickly identify these parts of components if he were to visit this university.

A more careful look at what seems to be these unconnected departments would reveal that some of the components seem to have characteristics of some of the other components. It would, therefore, on the basis of these characteristics, be possible to label them according to their commonality or their similarities. In this case, three different labels have been attached.

By grouping them, a pattern would emerge. Some would appear as disciplines, and they would be found in a grouping on the university campus for administrative purposes, at least, in what we traditionally call the College of Arts and Sciences. Others would be recognized as professional schools or colleges, which would be rather loosely identified with each other. There would probably be no organizational superstructure operating within this other than the total university. The third category would be a miscellaneous group of organizations called centers, bureaus, or institutes.

My concern in this presentation is with the first two of these types of organizations or suborganizations which the sociologist would discover as he examined the university as an institution.

A university or college is a particular kind of social institution, established for a recognized purpose by the society. It is concerned with valid knowledge—truth, if you prefer. The reason for the existence of a university within a society such as ours is the commitment on the part of the society to the importance of validated knowledge as a base from which to proceed. But concern for valid knowledge is not a simple or unitary phenomenon. The concern is expressed in a variety of ways which can be demonstrated in the form of a continuum.

The continuum ranges from the search for knowledge at one end to the use of knowledge at the other. Sometimes it is better to express it as a series of concentric circles with the middle representing a search and with the succeeding larger circles representing the various areas of concern. In this way, the increasing length of the circumference represents the relative number of people involved at each level of the concern.

Along the continuum lie a variety of activities. Pure research is at one end, and it is found in the form of the pursuit of basic truths. At the middle ranges of the continuum are attempts to discover the means by which the knowledge, which is discovered in the basic search, can be usefully applied in the service of man. At the use end of the continuum will be found many activities intended to bring to man the advantages that validated knowledge makes available to him.

An example is drawn from the field of agriculture. Researchers in the pure sciences search for and find some insight, such as the principles in the field of genetics. In the course of their activities, they report this to their scholarly colleagues and make it available to others outside of their immediate circle of concerned people.

Perhaps in the School of Agriculture, the professor takes the insight and strives to develop new strains of grain. His activities are located along the middle of the stream, in the research and development areas of the continuum. In the process, perhaps new strains of grain are actually discovered. After adequate testing, it will then be processed through some channel such as agricultural representatives who go out into the field and encourage the practitioners of the science of agriculture to make use of the new findings.

In this process of validation, the whole of the continuum has been involved as the process moves from the search through the application to the use. It also has involved a variety of different units on the university campus. One can draw from engineering, or from any other of the fields, similar kinds of examples

Over the years, a reasonably clear pattern for unlocking the secrets of nature, for developing useful applications of knowledge, and for purveying the benefits to society has emerged. Though not exclusively the province of the university, two of the three functions commonly are found on university campuses.

First, the disciplines seek basic knowledge within a delimited area of specialization; subjects such as history, physics, psychology, and mathematics are examples of areas of research and discipline concern.

Secondly, the professional schools, each drawing on its relevant and undergirding disciplines, do their own research and development in a continuing effort to expand the capacity of the profession to serve society; some examples are engineering, law, and medicine.

The third category, which takes place off campus and within the society, purveys professional services to clients within the society.

It is possible in a precise and nonmathematical way to illustrate the respective emphases of these units by drawing distribution curves along the knowledge continuum.

The disciplines will be found to be primarily concerned with what is called pure research and with activities related to it—writing, teaching, the preparation of graduate students to follow in the footsteps of the scholar, the teaching of persons who wish to major in fields of discipline, and so on.

The professional schools, on the other hand, will concentrate their interests on application research and on preparing practitioners for the profession.

Toynbee has spoken with clarity of the distinctions between the disciplines and the professions, though in a somewhat different context. He speaks of "man as scientist" and "man as technologist." This closely corresponds to the distinctions within the university.

Similarly, Allen B. Rosenstein, in reporting the UCLA study of engineering education, wrote: "We consider design to be the essence of engineering and have defined it as an iterative decision making process . . ." Then he went on to make the remark that is critical to us at this time, in reference to the decision making process. He concluded: "that we now recognize it as the common discipline of all professions."

The professions have technologists in the Toynbee sense and decision makers in Rosenstein's sense. The professions themselves carry the performance skills of the professions to the public. They make the actual applications in the field of use and so occupy the use end of the knowledge continuum.

If we combine the curves, we get a picture of three overlapping curves which have clearly definable emphases in function and yet a strong provision for overlapping. If we prepare a similar curve for a university, the three kinds of university elements that appear in the organizational structure can similarly be categorized.

The first one will deal with the disciplines, the second one with the professional schools, and the third one with the miscellaneous units which are put together for a variety of different purposes on the campus.

Since the purposes of the professional schools and of the disciplines are not the same, and since the behaviors and orientations of the two kinds of units are different, there is a strong tendency for the disciplines to be more or less closely knit into one university subsystem and for the professional schools to be loosely associated to form another. No set of expectations and norms which appropriately derives from the one can be expected to be a good fit for the other. Failure to recognize this causes untold difficulties on college campuses.

It should be emphasized that what is said here about the respective roles of the disciplines and the professional schools is intended only to be analytic and descriptive, not critical or derogatory. For very good reasons the university hosts within itself the several functions and emphases. The distinctions, or specializations, are necessary and functional.

It is abundantly clear up to this point that I build for the question, "Is teacher education a discipline or profession?"—that for decades teacher education has been the victim of an inability to decisively answer this question. On some campuses it has been a department or division of arts and sciences. On some it has had a separate college status but has been classed with the disciplines within the organization and in the minds of people. On still others the whole institution has claimed to be committed to teacher education. Finally, on some campuses it has had both the status and stance of a professional school.

Undoubtedly there have been many reasons for the confused situation. It is beyond the scope of this paper to explore the question. It can be said with confidence, however, that both teacher education and public school education have suffered from the confused situation over whether we are indeed a profession and whether we are indeed properly served by a professional school.

In the opinion of this writer, teacher education is inherently a professional school, even as teaching is inherently a profession. Teacher education belongs in the company of the decision makers. It meets the criterion of an important social service, and its decisions are based upon the social and behavioral sciences. To protest that it but poorly meets the criteria for a profession begs the issue and delays the day when the criteria might be adequately met.

To categorize teaching as a discipline is to subject it to the control and the norms of the scholarly disciplines. Under such circumstances it can only suffer by comparison and be condemned in perpetuity to reputations of mediocrity. Professors of education cannot expect to be both scholar to the level of those in the disciplines and professional to the level of those in the other professional schools; to attempt to do so is to invite low status in both.

There may be in your midst many who are saying, "We have been a professional school for many years," but the concept of being a professional school must exist not only on the organization chart but in the minds of men. And if, indeed, our self-image is not such that we hold our heads high as a professional school, or if our behavior is such that our colleagues do not perceive us to be in that category, then we still have the problem, even if we have the professional structure. In my view, we should move to assert our professional school status with vigor and to firmly establish it as a reality The hour for action already is very late.

CHAIRMAN SMITH: The subcommittee attempted to develop the ideas in systems terms. We would like to ask you, Dr. Pilecki, to give us a brief outline of systems theory as it applies to our discussions here.

PILECKI: At the risk of providing redundant information to that segment of the audience already conversant with systems theory and its terminology, we feel it is nonetheless necessary to spend a few minutes defining those terms to be used in the subsequent presentations by this panel.

Thus, by system, we mean a set of interacting units with spatial as well as temporal boundaries. And it should be added that systems exist with a purpose, or with a goal.

In his work, the systems analyst shows immediate concern for identifying what *is* the system, as opposed to the negasystem or those entities which are not spatially or temporally a part of the system. This is important in order to identify those processes and controls which work on, monitor, and result in the incoming energies, the tangible and intangible products, and the evaluative information, respectively, which relate to the purposes of the system.

Systems have a number of interesting and vital attributes, or commonalities, a few of which we will review here.

All systems but the smallest contain smaller units or subsystems. Conversely, all systems but the largest are contained in larger systems or suprasystems. The significance of this to us, as Dr. Howsam will point out, is that it is this suprasystem from which emanates the authority for the subsystem to act.

As we noted before, systems are goal-oriented. This purposiveness permits achieving identical results even from different starting conditions.

There is a self-regulatory process of balance and control, usually a function of feedback, in which the system blocks, or neutralizes, or exercises some type of sanction against potentially harmful inputs. This results in greater, rather than less, stability.

We have been speaking of open systems, which by definition tend to exchange energies with their environment. Resulting from this exchange, the system becomes aware of environmental need and adapts in order to stay in tune with the larger systems from which it receives its authority to act.

We have presented a few definitions to set the stage for the subsequent presentation.

CHAIRMAN SMITH: Dr. Bulger has established the nature of education as a profession; Dr. Howsam has established the nature of the university campus and its relationship to the professional school; and now Dr. Pilecki has given us the primer for a system. Obviously, we plan to bring all of this together.

Dr. Howsam, will you do that for us?

HOWSAM: Dr. Pilecki has just given us a few quick concepts of systems. The purpose of including this is so we might use it as vehicle of dialogue for further considerations of the profession as a whole and its mode of control and operation. He has indicated that the systems create subsystems to achieve the purposes of the system itself; and the systems assign responsibilities and hold the subsystems accountable for achieving what is expected of them.

It appears defensible to state that a system is accountable only to its suprasystem. Since it is the suprasystem which established it, it is the suprasystem which can call it to account, decide whether it continues or discontinues, decide if it is to be rewarded or not rewarded, and so on. This I call the principle of accountability.

It appears equally defensible to state that effective systems, whether at the subsystem or suprasystem level, are responsive to the other systems to which they relate even though they are not accountable to them.

These two principles, it seems to us, are functionally useful in the present situation of parity and control and accountability and these kinds of things. They seem important as definitions for what we say.

Clearly, teacher education as we know it is a subsystem of the college or university system which establishes and supports it in order to achieve its own purpose as a university.

A system may have more than a single suprasystem, however. For example, a person may be a subsystem of the family, the church, the community, the work place, and still other systems, all at the same time. Each of these systems to which he belongs has norms by which attempts are made to control and influence the behavior of the individual. Similarly, institutions or organizations may have more than a single suprasystem to which they are accountable and from which they are controlled.

Teacher education may have more than a single suprasystem. These may include governmental units such as the state or local schools. Still another possibility is the organized teaching profession.

In education, probably as an accident of history, there is much confusion over what the suprasystems of teacher education ought to be. Other professions have established the system of education for the profession on university campuses as relatively autonomous units with the organized profession being an active partner and exercising control and influence over the quality and content of the training program. The preparation program has been seen in these cases as the training arm of the profession. Governmental inputs for the most part have been funds. Licensure has been administered by the state as a matter of practicality and law. The dominant influence both on training and practice has been the profession. Accrediting agencies have been established for purposes of quality control.

If you have two suprasystems, they are not likely to have equal control or influence over the university. I have been indicating that in the case of the other professional schools, the professional has been the dominant suprasystem. By contrast, in education we have seen the exact reverse for a long time: the governmental units have been dominant in the control and influence over teacher education, and the organized teaching profession has been the minority and relatively silent partner in the situation.

If education is to develop as a profession and make its optimal contribution, the ambiguity over the control of teacher education should be clarified. It should not be subject to direct control by either the state or the local education units.

I am going to try through analysis to indicate the suprasystems of two of the major educational units of our society, and to indicate the kinds of accountability relationships which ought to exist by virtue of the professional models being applied to the university set.

If you take teacher education as the subsystem or system which you are examining, and you seek out its suprasystem, it becomes obvious that the university is one of the suprasystems. If you seek another suprasystem, applying the professional model, you would conclude that the suprasystems for teacher education are the universities which host the programs and the profession which it serves.

In order to get some sort of meaning into that, it is useful to take the same process and apply it to the public schools. Whether you are talking about a local school unit or local school district is not of great concern. One of the suprasystems that is found in the control of the public schools by constitution in all of the states is the state itself. The schools are established as the responsibility of the state, and so clearly the state is the suprasystem of the public school district. Another principle established in American practice, and in law, is the fact that the schools are being made an agent of the local community, and so another suprasystem of the school must be the local community.

Now you have a pattern of two of the major units that are involved in teacher education, and each of them has identified for it its appropriate suprasystem. It is my hypothesis that in the years ahead, we must move as progressively and as steadily as we can in the direction of a decreased governmental influence in the control of teacher education and of the profession, if one wishes to deal with that in the system, and an increased participation in the control of the profession by the profession itself. This includes teacher education.

In racing over these rather quickly, the question arises, then: what kind of relationship exists between the teacher education program and the schools? If in the past we tended to look toward the school as being one of the controlling agencies of teacher education, what ought it to be? What ought the relationship to be, if not a controlled one? This attempts to show that the accountability principle is established through the suprasystems, and the collaborative relationship represents the responsive relationship of systems, one to the other. These two agencies exist within the common field, and their areas of interest overlap each other. The schools hire the people whom the training schools prepare, and therefore they must be interested in them. In addition, they participate in the training process through the provision of field opportunities and experiences for the students. Therefore, it is perfectly clear that there must be a relationship, but the important point is that the relationship should be a responsive, collaborative one, and not an accountability one.

In conclusion of this theme, let us take the concept of the teacher center, which is now coming to the attention of all of us. The teacher center should be a collaborative relationship between the employing institution and training institution. Through these two accountable bodies, each accountable to its own suprasystems, comes the proper community of participation of the different peoples and also the kinds of participation which they should have. The public, the representation of the state, the representation of the university, the representation of the profession all flow into the collaborative process through the two main partners in the relationship, which are, of course, the teacher education branch of the university and the public school as the employer of the teachers.

I suggest on behalf of the committee, and on behalf of those of us who have thought about this for a considerable time, that if we are to avoid in the months immediately ahead some very serious conflicts of interest, some very serious mistakes in the way of precedent setting, we should have some such principles as these clearly in mind.

CHAIRMAN SMITH: One type of analysis dealing with interrelationships previously discussed is based on a model which Dr. Pilecki will discuss for us now.

PILECKI: Using the systems approach, one way to study these interrelationships would be from a relatively simple relationship model based upon three orders of relationships. In the first order, we study dissimilar systems which depend upon each other for existence. For our purposes, let us examine other than these necessary relationships. Instead, let's ask how similar systems relate; for example, how "A" relates to "Z."

When the relation of similar systems produces more than any one system could produce individually, the result is a tendency toward synergy, or synchronized energy. However, when similar systems work in opposition, or in such a fashion as to unnecessarily redo or repeat the others' work, the common goal is not met, and a third order or contradictory relationship occurs.

The significance of the following rests, then, upon the acceptance of the premise that social systems are similar, that one is contained within a larger system, and that to maximize their effectiveness and efficiency it is most desirable to effect a tendency toward synergy, or a second order relationship.

There are several criteria for this relationship. The end objective or anticipated output of the systems direct the systems. This objective is accepted and understood by all; it is not a vague statement of goal. In achieving that ultimate goal, there are objectives which can be used as the basis for the assessment of accomplishment. These objectives, rather than equivocations or generalities, are communicated, measurable, and attainable. Another criterion is the agreement of a specified means for goal achievement, rather than the disordered independent actions among the systems. Finally, the criteria for assessing goal achievement include measurable subgoals or short-range goals in defined ranges, as opposed to plain reliance on the end goal only, if any criterion is applied.

Using these criteria, we constructed a matrix to examine teacher education as a system, and hopefully to identify a means for determining the order of interrelationships with larger systems.

On the left, we list from supra- to smaller systems, society, the field of education, universities, and the teacher training colleges. Along the top, we place the criteria for determining these interrelationships: the end objectives, subgoals, means for achievement, and criteria for assessing goal achievement. By considering what is the anticipated output of teacher education from the point of view of society in general, of the field of education, of the universities, and of teacher training colleges, we see a tendency toward greater specificity, as one might expect, as we move from the larger to the smaller systems. In attempting to determine the types of relationships, we deliberately stayed at a national level. The result was an overall similarity and a very general tendency toward synergy.

However, in trying to study this matter at regional and at local levels, the result was not the same. As in one example already alluded to by Dr. Howsam, there tends to be disparity in goals and so forth between universities and teacher training colleges, and for that matter, between society and universities.

Neither time nor objective permits any greater discussion of these disparities now. We can refer you to the complete paper done for the ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education and hope that you will find this approach both interesting and useful.

CHAIRMAN SMITH: All through this discussion we have been talking about control of the profession. There have existed for a long time means of quality control in our profession, such as accreditation of teacher education programs.

Dr. Bulger, would you like to address yourself to the question of whether these things fit into our discussion or whether they are alien?

BULGER: We didn't want anyone to feel that we were not conscious of the great contributions made by the accrediting groups in our society. I quote from last evening's Hunt lecture by AACTE's executive director, Dr. Pomeroy: "Nowhere is the complexity of the process of teacher preparation made as evident as it is in accreditation. The philosophical problems, the budgetary, political and educational problems all come together in accreditation."

I know we all appreciate the tremendous job that the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education has done for us in the area of quality control, and we are also mindful of the efforts on the part of the National Education Association, through its National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, in proposing the model teacher standards and licensure act that is receiving attention throughout the country.

It is my understanding that the state of California has started a program based on this model, and I know that the New York State Teachers Association has reintroduced a bill based on this model in our legislature. And both Michigan and Colorado have been thinking along these lines. So here is a model that should be considered by many of us throughout the country.

Then we should remind ourselves of the fine work that is being done by our regional accreditation groups. All of these efforts to keep teacher education in the field of nongovernmental accreditation are positive. As Dr. Howsam was saying, we think this is the direction to keep it in.

To answer your question, Dr. Smith, certainly these things fit firmly into the basic fabric of policy and decision making in teacher education.

Implications and Future Directions for Teacher Education and AACTE

George W. Denemark
President-Elect of AACTE
Chairman of the Session

CHAIRMAN DENEMARK: Our plan of procedure for this session is to hear from four expert witnesses, members of our Association, who will make whatever remarks they wish to make on teacher education and the implications for Association efforts, then to provide an opportunity of some five minutes or so for members of the Board to raise questions with those witnesses, and finally, to provide an opportunity for other members of the Association here in the audience to comment and react as they wish.

First Witness

HARRY BOWES: I am Harry Bowes, former president of the Dakota State College at Madison, South Dakota, and the new president, or it might be more accurate to say, the current president of Southern Colorado State College in Pueblo. My assignment is to present my views on the major issues facing teacher education today, and how AACTE should respond.

First: Teacher certification, and its auxiliary enterprise, teacher accreditation, must continue to be cooperative ventures involving colleges and universities, public schools, state school officials, the organized profession, and the public-at-large. And this involvement must be both in certification and in accreditation. It is the responsibility of AACTE to continuously press this as imperative. Institutions have not responded too meaningfully to demands for change. Too much effort has gone into adhering to guidelines and making meaningless reports.

Second: Teacher certification is neither the responsibility of the classroom teachers as suggested by the Model Teacher Standards and Licensure Act currently proposed by the NEA, nor is it the sole responsibility of those trained in professional education. Teacher education is in a unique bind, caught as it is between the forces of public control, academic control, and control by the public schools.

And it is the responsibility of AACTE to continually resist imbalance. It is no longer a question of whether higher education and state boards will share certification with teacher associations. It is a question of who else will be involved.

Third: Teacher education cannot rest on a collection of courses taken in a group of academic departments which have been arranged primarily to foster graduate study or to protect the academic boundaries of those departments. This includes professional education. Teacher education came late to the idea that its outcomes represent practice rather than knowledge. There has been a failure to realize that education is not a discipline in the same way that the arts and sciences are disciplines. Performance-based teacher education is an effort to break away from the former system. The concept seeks to identify the skills a teacher should possess and the activities he is called upon to undertake. The challenge is to identify targets of varying degrees of priority.

The obvious concern is the area of learning which cannot be readily translated into language of performance such as attitudes, imagination, and commitments. Research appears to indicate that these attitudes and characteristics are "caught, not taught."

So it is the responsibility of AACTE to resist certification standards or accreditation standards that tend purposefully or by accident to preclude needed changes in teacher and discipline-related education.

Fourth: There is a new surge of parent power. Parents are exercising more and more influence on the public schools. This was first observed when urban blacks looked critically at their schools and found them wanting, not only in money but in being related to the black community itself. Now many groups are finding frustration in an educational establishment that has not dealt with work experience or with the technology they believe should have a place in the school.

The idea that only those certified by the "educational professionals" may come into meaningful relationship with school children is an idea which is unacceptable to many concerned parents. They may not long tolerate this criterion.

So it is the responsibility of AACTE to ask those who suggest limiting school training and educational personnel to present a case based on research evidence that warrants such limitations.

I represent a state college which regionally serves a population which approaches one-third Mexican-American. They represent a minority of over 10 million nationally, the second largest in the United States. They are not really a minority in the Southwest; in fact, they comprise one of my institution's major constituencies. Their noisy pressure groups, more than their representative and responsible leadership, make my task and your task more difficult.

The demands are many and varied, but I would rather prepare hundreds of Spanish-surnamed students for business and educational leadership than enrolling, but failing, thousands.

AACTE and professionals in teacher education must assume the leadership for developing a communication process that meets the needs and hopes of these people.

Their hopes and dreams about what education can do for them are similar to those of all children and parents. They have no one leader who can tell you what their people expect or will demand, but they are apprehensive about the system which was nonresponsive for many generations. They are sensitive to the recruitment of their trained professionals which are in critically short supply. They demand support of areas that really meet the needs of their people.

In general, teacher education has been philosophically and culturally isolated. The road to progress in present times dictates that we rationally set our course in light of needs and responsible demands.

We must conduct in-service programs and seminars to prepare teachers and paraprofessionals to serve district and cultural situations.

AACTE and its administrators must find out what our minority and majority communities are thinking and assist their efforts if they are justified.

There is increasing evidence that the new roles taken by nonprofessionals and parents are, in fact, productive. If the school is to help many different kinds of learners, the teacher must be a relating model.

Fifth: Teacher education must become reconciled to the new unionism of the classroom teacher. Whether it is the NEA or AFT, the classroom teachers are now organized and have both money and political muscle. They are demanding part of the action in certification. They are saying two things: (1) those who teach teachers must themselves be good teachers; and (2) those who teach methods of teaching must themselves be teaching children or they invalidate their own claim to knowing effective methodology.

AACTE must use its influence to insist that methods of teaching do relate to children and that those who do not teach 1972 vintage children cannot teach others to teach this vintage crop. To try to ignore this fundamental assumption made by the classroom teachers is to ignore everything we know about an idea whose time has come. And today the teacher is organized to insist on this.

In summary, I am making a plea for realism. Let us move only as fast in imposing regulations as we can substantiate justifications. Let us not set the stage for reaction if avoidable. Although centralization represents a favorite device to insure widespread agreement, its efficiency is overrated. Central leadership, once in control, usually maintains that it is uniquely qualified to see clearly the needs of an entire system, profession, or nation. Carried from the point of guidance and coordination to control it has, in my opinion, proved disastrous in almost every case.

Let us not lose the gains of 50 years by a reaction which we can have and a direction we can take if we fail to stop and take note of "this whole new ball game."

We in education have agreed for many years that we are seeing an educational evolution. Because of our lack of meaningful response, we are seeing an educational revolution. Like all revolutions, we had better be braced for some disastrous and heartbreaking turn of events. Hopefully, the outcome will put our system in tune with the times.

We as an Association have examined, but we as educators and administrators have been reluctant, if not resistant to deal seriously with the basic assumptions on which our house stands. There is little time left to deal objectively with fundamental issues such as who should enter teacher education; what should be studied; what should the options be; where and how should study be conducted; and how do we serve present and future needs of students, parents, and public – real and imaginary.

Unless we do deal effectively with these issues, the institutions we preside over will be financially strangled by the public which is soon to become the decision making group in a formerly sacred academic venture.

I do not mean to be superficial about the things we have accomplished; much has been done, but there is much more that needs to be done. And it is not going to be as simple as we once thought it would be.

NATHANIEL H. EVERS: President Bowes, I assume you suggest that AACTE should continue its concern and support of NCATE as the agency for accreditation. What is a problem for the Board is its posture on what other constituent agencies ought to be involved with NCATE. NCATE, through its new commission, defines school boards, national associations of state directors of teacher certification, and chief state school officers as constituent agencies.

I wonder if you would be willing to comment on what other kinds of organizations and/or groups ought to be involved directly with the support and continuation of support for the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education.

BOWES: I think there are many ways that the input I referred to can take place. Obviously, we are seeing pressure from the organized profession itself. We are seeing the state boards having more and more to say about accreditation, at least at the institutions under their jurisdiction. I realize that NCATE is making efforts toward shared responsibility in setting standards. I think a greater effort and one more visible need to be made in public in this regard.

WILLIAM A. HUNTER: In various points, Dr. Bowes, you referred to the profession, even in response to Dr. Evers' question. What do you have in mind when you refer to the profession from such a fragmented base?

BOWES: I was not definitive enough. Where I used the term profession, I was referring to practicing teachers.

HUNTER: Only the classroom teacher?

BOWES: Yes, sir.

HUNTER: Not the administrator who comes to the classroom? Not the professor who prepares the teacher?

BOWES: No, sir. When I used the term, I was referring to the practicing classroom teacher at secondary level.

HUNTER: This, of course, is contrary to any definition of profession as it would relate to medicine and law, would it not be?

BOWES: I'm not sure I would want to debate that. I think it is a delineation.

HUNTER: When you refer to the profession of medicine, you refer to all aspects of people who are involved as practitioners, as researchers, as medical doctors. There is no delineation, no fragmentation as such, although there are different responsibilities, with different people of the profession assumed, but yet here we exclude people who are involved in the same act, merely because of station?

BOWES: I will accept your definition. I was merely explaining how I used the term.

HUNTER: Do you think this is a good state of being for the profession?

BOWES: No, I was just explaining the term and, as I say, it was only definitive of the profession in a broad sense. I agree with your point that you make.

IRVAMAE APPLEGATE: Dr. Bowes, during your presentation the statement was made that teacher education is not a discipline like the academic disciplines. What do you mean by the statement? Where is the dividing line?

BOWES: The point I am trying to make is that teacher education should be based on performance and practice, more than to be held as a body of knowledge, much, as I said, like the arts.

Second Witness

DONALD CRUICKSHANK: My name is Donald Cruickshank. I am currently President of Wheelock College in Boston, Massachusetts and recently from Ohio State University.

Today several of us have been asked to give brief testimony about how the Association can best serve its membership—some 850 colleges and universities which now annually overproduce 90 percent of America's teachers. More specifically, I have been requested to respond in my new role as head of a small college which prepares persons to work with very young children. The latter request was less difficult than I had first assumed since, after being on the job for about six months, I find the basic professional concerns at Wheelock College to be about the same as those at Ohio State University.

In order to put my remarks in a particular context, I should like to suggest that teacher education is a particular kind of system or assemblage of parts which in their totality combine to produce teachers. The assemblage of parts has been described by Masoner to include 1,200 institutions of higher education; 50 state legislatures, state boards of education, and state departments of education; numerous independent or semi-independent boards of professional standards within the states; six regional accrediting associations and several accrediting groups at the national level; 50 state education associations affiliated with the NEA, and perhaps as many state units of the AFT, and literally dozens of other professional associations and learned societies. Certainly to this list should be added thousands of school systems, private foundations and businesses and, of course, the federal government. So widespread and pervasive is the system that it seems (or perhaps is) unmanageable and immovable and as such is negatively perceived and referred to by critics as "the establishment."

In this context, the most significant question to which AACTE needs to address itself is the adequacy of the system. To what extent is the teacher education system, in fact, a deliberately designed set of interrelated and interacting components which function in an integrated fashion to attain predetermined purposes? Would you wager that an investigation would determine that the teacher education system is not deliberately designed, that its components or parts generally are not interrelated nor do they usually interact, and that at best we have only a vague notion of what the system's purposes are? A study of the governance of teacher education in America—who makes decisions about what—certainly would illuminate the nature of the present system and its efficiency and effectiveness. That the system and its components may not be integrated nor efficient has been supported recently on two occasions.

Instance One: In the February 4 issue of *Higher Education and National Affairs Journal* it was reported that the National Advisory Council on Education Professions Development, declared in a report submitted a few weeks ago to the President and Congress, that policies governing a number of federal educational programs are at best unclear. The Council concluded that "the resources devoted to the formulation of policies are inadequate; the processes employed are primitive; and the results are unacceptable." The report classified educational effort by the federal government into two levels. The first level concerns national commitment or broad goals including universal education, racial integration, and improvement of educational personnel. The second level concerns how action is taken to achieve these broad goals. In looking at level one, the investigators found that federal educational agencies which dispense money for educational programs are not doing so according to policies clearly stating the agency's position. On the contrary, the Council said that, in some important areas, policy statements simply do not exist or often do not go beyond one-sentence assertions.

It added that some policy statements are not informative nor do they arise from any systematic analysis of issues. Commenting directly on the Bureau of Educational Personnel Development, the Council said "it is not possible to get a clear idea of what the agency's position is on many issues which so crucially influence the direction and quality of its activities." It concludes that the Bureau needs a policy statement identifying problems and demonstrating how the programs it establishes are designed to reduce or eliminate them.

Instance Two: The same censure can be and has been applied to professional education including institutions preparing preservice teachers. Paul M. Masoner, dean of the University of Pittsburgh's School of Education, lamented in *An Imperative: A National Policy For Teacher Education:*

> Far too many decisions relating to this most important area of professional preparation have been made on an *ad hoc* basis, often without reference to the experience of others, often without knowledge of the evidence of careful research, and almost always without any consideration of basic policy since nothing that could be truly called public policy really exists.

Donald P. Cottrell at Ohio State University argued similarly and has proposed establishment of a National Teacher Education Foundation responsible for the identification of priorities in teacher education program development. The Association itself proposes a National Center for Teacher Education within a National Institute of Education, although I have not seen that proposal and do not know of its contents.

Clearly, both within the public and private sectors interested in teacher preparation, there has been little effort or ability for teacher education components to operate as a fully functioning teacher education system. The federal government more often than not goes its way attempting to effect change in teacher education through use of "hot money" for "hot ideas" supporting programs such as the Comprehensive Elementary Teacher Education Models, protocol materials, and more recently educational renewal centers. At the same time the other components—our colleges, the state certification offices, and others—do their own thing, oblivious of any need to work within a grand design or integrated, interacting system.

Perhaps teacher education should not be a system, but merely a loose and unintentional federation. Consequently, there seems to be nothing more important for this Association to do than to determine how the system can be made to work more effectively. A strategy which could guide the Association in this endeavor can be extrapolated from Bela Banathy with steps as follows:

1. The Association might determine what has to be done in teacher education and how.

2. Identify who or what has the potential to do it; in other words, identify components of this national system.

3. Distribute functions among the components.

4. Schedule, supervise, and evaluate the work.

To implement the strategy the Association would need to assemble an extensive data bank of components and their resources in teacher education and in a scientific manner solicit from its membership, and from others, issues and problems confronting the profession. Once accomplished the Association's responsibility would extend to the determination of priorities and a solicitation of interest and expertise in the tasks. Such a set of clear priorities identified by the total system would indeed have legitimacy, provide direction, and foster interaction. They would clearly command the attention of both public and private funding agencies. Deliberate effort of this sort to chart the course for teacher education would indeed be a welcome change to the present approach of responding to an individual who sometimes has a great notion. The implications of this most brief yet fundamental first generation proposal to AACTE are clear.

In summary, I am suggesting that the Association can best serve its membership by playing the dominant, coordinating role in producing a more dynamic, interrelated system for teacher education. It is assumed that it is within the Association's ability to perform in this leadership role and that its membership would see value in the reconsideration of its priorities. In addition, the result of such an effort should convince each of us that our membership in the Association was directly related to the purposeful, coordinated reduction or elimination of the most serious problems we face as we attempt to prepare teachers.

RICHARD E. LAWRENCE: Dr. Cruickshank, is there an implication in your use of the word "effective" when you talk about determining how the system can be made to work more effectively? And is there an implication in your first point—that of determining what has been done in teacher education and then how it should be done—that you think the purposes for which we are now working may be either inadequate or inappropriate? Further, might this involve a complete redefinition of purpose for the system about which we are talking? Or are you assuming that there is some kind of clear agreement on purpose at this point?

CRUICKSHANK: Most of us would agree that the overall purpose of production of educational personnel is involved and that all these components within the system do something in that regard. We might reconstruct what our notion of education personnel should be as we go along, but I think essentially it is to produce educational personnel as a medical system would produce medical personnel. I think, rather, the way we do it might be more significant by the joining together of component parts of the system and seeing how they contribute at each level. The whole process, as I see it, is a design problem, a development problem, a limitation problem, and an evaluation problem. I think in teacher education we give considerable, if not most, of our attention to the implementation of problems and processes, and we give less attention to design in terms of system.

LAWRENCE: Would you agree that the purposes of teacher education are at least somewhat related to the purposes of the system out there in which the educational personnel are going to work?

CRUICKSHANK: Do I view that as part of the system?

LAWRENCE: Yes.

CRUICKSHANK: It is part of the system. You never really adequately can define the system, but you ought to see what the components are.

LAWRENCE: Are the purposes of the schools themselves as a fundamental part of that system clearly enough defined at this point in time; if they are defined, are they appropriate for what may be happening down the road a ways, so that we can use those purposes as a basis for making our system more effective? You used the word "effective" rather than efficient, and I was glad of that.

CRUICKSHANK: I use them both. I think there are a number of rationales you could use for designing a system to prepare teachers or other educational personnel. One rationale could be to look down the road considerably, deciding the kinds of schools programs we want children to have, like the University of Georgia model approach. There are many other good ways and other assumptions out of which the system could work.

PEARLIE C. DOVE: I would like to ask Dr. Cruickshank about the use of the phrase "coordinating role." AACTE is made up of not only institutions of higher learning. When you use the term "coordinating role," do you see the Association as furnishing the leadership for bringing federal, state, or the public institutions into such a role?

CRUICKSHANK: We have to take the leadership. I think it is very clear that there will be no leadership left for education to take in the way we might define education now. In the total system, it seems at this point in time that we do not gather most of the resources; an effort on the part of a national association to bring people together is likely to be much more effective than an effort on the part of combined school districts or combined colleges. I think the Association has an extra visibility.

DOVE: You see AACTE as being a catalyst?

CRUICKSHANK: Yes.

HUNTER: Are you suggesting that we move toward a national system of education?

CRUICKSHANK: No, not at all. I am merely suggesting that we act as a system of teacher education. It has never been defined very clearly. There are disparate parts, not related and sometimes malfunctioning so far as the total system is concerned; and even as far as the subsystem is concerned these parts are malfunctioning in their own roles. I am suggesting the Association has the opportunity and the responsibility to define that system, to assess its parts, to find where its resources lie, to identify the problems in the field, and to match those resources and problems to move teacher education ahead. In some ways the system moves less consciously than perhaps it could, but we need to make some effort in those directions.

Third Witness

CHARLES HAYES: I am Charles L. Hayes, president of Albany State College, one of the units of the university system of Georgia. Prior to my going to the state of Georgia, I was chief of the Development Institution Branch of the U. S. Office of Education.

My concern fundamentally dates back to the kinds of things I have not seen done by AACTE with reference to teacher education. Specifically, I refer to my three years of experience with the Development Institution Branch, during which time we saw and observed but one proposal which identified and addressed itself to teacher education.

It seems to me that the AACTE Board could address itself to a consortia type of activity to enable the small developing institutions—private, parochial, and black schools—to improve themselves inasmuch as AACTE is a voluntary organization and inasmuch as the majority of the member institutions are small, some state-supported, and many private. It appears to me that much of the soft money which has been going out from the Office of Education could very well be generated by the Board itself. I offer as an example the American Association of Junior Colleges which, in 1967, came to the Office of Education with a proposal for support, and which, through the developing junior colleges, was supported to the tune of around $900,000 in the first year. That program has continued to this day. It seems to me that, for AACTE, that kind of thrust could be made for developing institutions.

In short, there are those of us in the field of education who are quite concerned that many of the so-called elite institutions are the ones that are identified with the grants, and too many times we are asked as small institutions to piggyback their programs rather than have programs identified on our campuses. AACTE could take a positive stand in that direction.

It is my conclusion that the AACTE Board of Directors could take a positive direction in attempting to see that *all* AACTE constituents are treated equally in terms of the soft money which seems to be coming out of Washington today.

I have some further concerns. One concern is about the total involvement of all departments and districts of teacher education. AACTE is an institutional organization with institutional representatives; however, in preparing teachers throughout this nation, we involve not only people at the college level but those in the public sector as well. It seems to me that within the structure of AACTE, recognition ought to be given to the partners in teacher education, namely, the practitioners to which Harry Bowes just referred. They too ought to be a part of AACTE. We need to indicate that we are concerned precisely with what they are doing and with the roles they must play for us in teacher education.

We are concerned too with what we are getting for the money that we put into the Association.

These, I think, are some of the issues facing the Board in the next year or so.

If the Association is concerned about quality education, why has it not addressed itself to the improvement of all member institutions? Here again we go back to something which Harry Bowes said in his testimony with reference to the support of NCATE. It is quite apparent that all AACTE institutions should be given the support of this organization as well as all other organizations which might aid us in attempting to improve teacher education.

Finally, I must say that there is some concern about the black sector of higher education and the black sector in AACTE. The Association must give some recognition to the programs that are good in the black sector and assist us in improving the programs which need to be improved.

CHAIRMAN DENEMARK: Dean Howsam, I know that we talked the other day about your notions of involving public school personnel more essentially in the activities of the Association through a representative role. I wonder if you might just want to comment on that point at this time?

ROBERT B. HOWSAM: I am not sure that I am ready to put it into that particular context, but I do think there is the question as to whether the AACTE is an overarching institution that ought to attempt to bring within itself the other institutions in the interest of a single unified approach to teacher education or whether it is one of the smaller parts that ought to take the initiative—as Dr. Cruickshank seemed to be implying—in bringing together the other parts to create some new kind of structure, out of which the purposes of education could be discerned and the role of teacher education in this could be defined. I think we have an issue squarely before us as to whether or not we can be the tent in which an operation takes place or whether we should try to be one of the units within which some larger structure has to be created.

I am thoroughly in agreement with the kinds of things that are being implied here; and I think Don Cruickshank was saying the need is apparent. The vehicle for achieving it does not seem to be present. Now, somebody ought to do something; and I think some people are saying, "Look, if we know about it, why don't we do it?" Maybe that is about all that can be said.

BENEDICT J. SURWILL: President Hayes, you mentioned that it might be somewhat more difficult for soft money to be received by the bulk of AACTE institutions. Do you think there is something that AACTE could specifically do to assist in obtaining the grants or the money?

HAYES: Specifically, I think that AACTE as an organization might sponsor, let us say, a consortium of 10 or 15 institutions with a particular kind of teacher education program that is definitive. Title III of the Higher Education Act of 1965 certainly would be amenable to such a proposal. As I have mentioned, the Office of Education received *only one proposal in teacher education*. We begged the people in teacher education to come forth. And I might say too that the proposal that was submitted for the Title V-E was at the request of the Office of Education. It seems quite apparent that AACTE could initiate some kind of planning grant money to bring institutions together so they might talk about what needs to be done. Following through with it, of course, would be left to a coordinating institution, but I do think AACTE could do this.

HOWSAM: Is it a stimulating kind of activity when AACTE leaves it to others rather than operating a number of different projects and programs which are supported by soft money?

HAYES: It would not be. With Title III moneys right now, funding is divided into three cycles, and it appears, quite frankly, that, within a three-year period, many of these institutions could improve themselves with this kind of money. But I still say that the initiative must be taken by the organization because that gives it the clout that it needs. Fifteen weak institutions getting together and sharing the moneys is not as effective.

KENNETH R. WILLIAMS: One of the things that many of us have noted in years past—and I think this is improving now—is that, when the Office of Education gets these bills together and they are passed so that funds are created, very often the guidelines are set up so that the large higher education institutions can benefit from them without difficulty. But sometimes, as far as the small schools are concerned, the guidelines are written in such a way that the small school cannot begin to comply. It is just completely out. That has somewhat improved, however.

What part could the Association play in eliminating this type of thing in the federal government, or is my appraisal of the situation fair?

HAYES: The Association could get some input into the Office of Education with reference to the implementation of guidelines as they are written. There are certain people who are asked to serve as consultants. I think if the organization made it known that it is willing to serve in that capacity, I am reasonably sure that the people in the Office of Education would be open to such a suggestion.

WILLIAMS: Is this situation prevalent or is it an exaggeration?

HAYES: Some guidelines—for example, those for the Title III program—were written for developing institutions which, in fact, exclude the programs you are discussing. In other kinds of programs where guidelines are so written, such as establishing a research center on the campus, you could not do this kind of thing because it calls for expertise on the campus, and many were not able to come forward with the necessary kinds of hardware.

WILLIAMS: With reference to representation in AACTE from public school personnel or from school personnel as partners in the teacher education enterprise, what is the best way to get this representation?

But, first, let me go through the question. It seems to me there are two things under discussion here that are closely related in the funding to all institutions of higher learning for teacher education purposes. I think that it is financially smart, as well as educationally sound, for colleges to recognize that much of this support for teacher education is coming by way of school systems or by way of state departments of education. Much of the federal funding is done where a school system may go to a university or college for a partnership grant. I think it is educationally sound to recognize that the public school systems are really authentic partners in this whole teacher education enterprise.

We have to find some way in AACTE for authentic continuing representation from school personnel, both because it is educationally sound in terms of a true partnership and because it is financially smart in terms of grantmanship at both levels.

The question, then, from the institutional standpoint would be: is it better to have institutional representation, let us say, from Albany State through joint appointment? That is, we can effect joint appointments of school personnel, and, through that route, we can designate institutional representatives to AACTE, which we are in fact doing anyway. The other route would be for the Association to say that any college or university may designate an institutional representative—even though this person is not on the university of college faculty or payroll.

Dr. Hayes, would your thought be in terms of getting school representation in the AACTE where either of these routes could be good or do you have some other suggestion as to how we can bring the school personnel into an authentic relationship here?

HAYES: I think that either of them would satisfy the position I have taken. It is quite apparent we must have joint appointments. We do have joint appointments with the school system. Many of us are being asked to put these people's names on catalogs, appoint them to advisory councils, and so forth. It seems to me that they must be represented in AACTE if we are to have a partnership as we have for teacher education itself. I might say that I do not care by what means it is done as long as it is done.

CRUICKSHANK: May I ask is it legal or illegal for a college to designate a nonstaff member of the college—that is somebody from the school district—to be on its representative list?

EVERS: I think it is quite within the institution's prerogative to name its own institutional representative. If it so desires to name someone who has an adjunct professorship or something like that, it would be quite acceptable. We do not ever say, as far as I know, to an institution, "The one you named is not acceptable."

Fourth Witness

HENRY J. HERMANOWICZ: I am Henry Hermanowicz, dean of the College of Education at Illinois State University. AACTE, to be candid, often has been characterized as an "establishment" organization, top-heavy with administrative representatives, and one projecting a posture of reacting, responding, and defending rather than directing, leading, and innovating developments in teacher education. This, of course, is an invalid caricature of AACTE, but the Board of Directors cannot afford in its future actions to lend any legitimacy to such a stereotype.

I am convinced that AACTE has been a major force for the substantive improvement of teacher education in the past, and that its future holds even greater promise.

I see four fundamental needs as being met with greater leadership from AACTE in the future.

First, AACTE should conduct regular national supply-demand analyses related to professional personnel. I am *not* suggesting that AACTE duplicate the descriptive studies conducted by the NEA in its annual report, "Supply of Teachers in the United States," but I am principally concerned that AACTE contract for more analytical, interpretive studies. Today, the nature of supply and demand situation is in a state of controversial shambles. *I am suggesting that some leadership should have been taken by this organization in making some prognostication of supply and demand of teachers in the United States*—indicating areas of needed qualitative improvement in educational practice, probably including suggestions of strategies for coping with some of the oversupply and undersupply problems, certainly giving us more analytical interpretive data than just straight descriptive studies, and certainly providing for the member institutions in teacher education a weather vane in terms of areas of need in this whole problematic field.

My second area of concern is that AACTE must emphasize greater leadership in research and development efforts in teacher education. I do not mean to discount AACTE's past accomplishments. However, the January 1971 mandate to AACTE, entitled *Crisis in Teacher Education*, indicated, among other functions, that the AACTE should (1) play a significant role in the development of conceptual framework for research and experimentation in teacher education, (2) stimulate research and experimentation by helping to identify and define both the broad areas and specific problems of research, and (3) assume responsibility for organizing consortia to conduct cooperative research in teacher education.

I am convinced that it is imperative that the Board of Directors make this mandate operational for long-term developments in teacher education and that it must be founded on fundamental knowledge, inquiry, and systematic experimentation rather than on political fashionability or optimism. AACTE must play a prominent role in such R&D efforts.

My third area of concern is that the Association must play an even greater role than it has in the past in other major movements related to teacher education and the teaching profession. For example, AACTE, in working with other agencies or with its own member institutions, should help to direct performance-based education in terms of its national impact on teacher education. I think it has taken some appropriate steps in that direction.

I think AACTE should pursue efforts to ascertain the implication of performance-based teacher education for teacher certification and for accreditation. The validation of accreditation standards and input to improving the accreditation process demand AACTE's immediate attention.

AACTE also should focus study upon the implications of performance-based teacher education for the graduate education of future teacher educators themselves. I am convinced the concept is going to have some revolutionary implications in that area.

The fourth area of concern I have is that AACTE must play a major role in influencing the direction of the federal government and of those philanthropic agencies having projects and efforts related to teacher education. And when I say "teacher education" I include in-service teacher training.

I have no answers in this area, but I do pose some questions. For example, what should be the R&D role of teacher education in the proposed National Institute of Education? How will AACTE make that role have some effect on the framework and future efforts of NIE? How should higher education institutions be most functionally involved in the educational renewal center strategy of USOE? What other critical areas in teacher education should be attacked by collaborative, multiagency efforts, including major input from AACTE?

I have just covered a rather diverse waterfront, indicating that AACTE must exert leadership in at least four areas: (1) a regular national supply and demand analysis of professional personnel; (2) R&D efforts related to teacher education; (3) other movements of substantive improvement in teacher education, like performance-based education; and (4) continued influence on the efforts of governmental and philanthropic agencies that become involved in teacher education.

I would like to close by endorsing Paul Masoner's suggestion as provided in his monograph and speech entitled *An Imperative: A National Policy For Teacher Education*. Dean Masoner suggests the necessity for incorporating what are now the various fragmented efforts of research, program development, teacher productivity, accreditation and certification, and a host of other matters which are being conducted by a multiplicity of agencies into some coherent national policy for teacher education. He feels that AACTE should assume leadership in helping shape such a policy, working with other major representative agencies. His proposal deserves your careful consideration if we are to proceed in the decade ahead to make the wisest use of the resources and talents available for a coordinated plan for national progress in the quality of education and teacher preparation.

REV. CARL A. HANGARTNER: I would like to raise the question of education as a discipline, because Dean Hermanowicz's comments about graduate education and R&D seem to go counter to the view sometimes expressed that education as a discipline is no longer operative in the preparation of professionals.

HERMANOWICZ: I do not want to sound arrogant in responding to your question, but 10 years ago I was interested in the question of whether education should or should not be a discipline. I no longer consider the question very worthwhile; I think my answer is somewhat, "I don't care." If I have to generate commendation of respectability by identifying characteristics indigenous to so-called disciplines, and then see if the field of education has some, if not all, of those characteristics, frankly, I think we ought to forget the question and, instead, address ourselves to the fundamental problems of trying to produce knowledgeable, artistic, skillful, and imaginative practitioners—meantime using what knowledge we have and systematizing other knowledge that seems to be functional in the process. If someone wants to call it an applied discipline or applied field, that is all right with me, but I don't want to get involved in the debate whether it should be.

HUNTER: Dean Hermanowicz's fourth concern referred to involvement of AACTE in a role of working with the government and with philanthropic foundations for helping institutions. Do you see in that any competition between AACTE and its member institutions?

HERMANOWICZ: I suspect that member institutions have competed and that they always will; throughout these colleges and universities preparing teachers, we have a certain amount of entrepreneurship and aggressiveness in searching for soft money that would allow them to pursue certain kinds of projects. I do not think that, as an organization, we can have any kind of directive to eliminate that role. I do think that the role I am suggesting that AACTE play more prominently is to have even greater influence on the various kinds of funding agencies, in terms of the parameters and nature of design that they cultivate for projects, and I mean philanthropic organizations as well as governmental. AACTE should develop inter-institutional consortia to make a more substantial impact on changes in teacher education.

SURWILL: Dean Hermanowicz, you have laid out four points of concern. As I listened to Presidents Bowes, Cruickshank, and Hayes, I thought that perhaps the new Board members will be interested in getting feedback from the many people who are in this organization. Once we get the point of view from the people in the organization, then perhaps we can get answers back to the people. It is not a one-day-a-year shot during which we meet in Chicago to talk about something and then go back to our places in, say, Montana and Kentucky. The important thing for a new Board member is to hear these cries and concerns that we should get some answers back to the people. Maybe this question of how we can get better communication will have to be looked at carefully by the Board.

HERMANOWICZ: I seriously doubt that you are ever going to have some kind of communication panacea during which everybody will rush in with ideas and suggestions from member institutions. However, the Board is obligated to search for information and ideas; there is no question about this. With your election to the Board, you are obligated to seek talents in member institutions and to develop a conceptual framework for needed research in teacher education. You have no choice; it is a directive to you. But I do not think you need feedback. I think you have to deliver. I think you are obligated to seek talents in member institutions to identify some of the most critical problems in teacher education that require some kind of systematic inquiry. You do not have to wait for feedback: you must go ahead and do it. I think you are obligated to identify areas where multi-institutional consortia must attack fundamental problems in teacher education. You have to start on that rather than wait for somebody to tell you.

CHAIRMAN DENEMARK: Now the floor is available to members of the audience to make whatever comments or raise whatever questions they wish.

ARTHUR MARTIN (Superintendent of Schools, Mauricetown, New Jersey): I just want to support the speakers who indicated that this conference at least should include more practitioners than you have. This is my first conference on the invitation of AACTE and I'm representing AASA. I have learned a great deal about teacher educators here in Chicago. I know my colleagues in AASA, as well as teachers and principals, will learn about it too.

BONNIE PAULSEM (Student at Wheelock College, Boston): I am President of the student body at Wheelock College, and I am an AACTE institutional representative—one of the first institutional representatives not a faculty member or administrator of an institution. It has been extremely rewarding to me to be able to come here and participate in this conference. I am in support of having more people like myself, who are not professionals but who will be educators of the young, to come to this conference. I hope to take back many of the things I have seen here, especially what I can tell them about the programs of schools receiving the Distinguished Achievement Awards last night.

JAMES WHEAT (Teacher Education, Graceland College, Iowa): As an outgrowth of the social issue discussion in consumer education today, we came up with several suggestions, or maybe I should say I did.

- One is that AACTE appoint a task force to create an organization for active political and social involvement of teacher educators, especially as it concerns problems of teacher educators. And the remainder of these relate to this first one, but yet they will stand on their own also.

- Second, devise strategies for attacking the racism in schools of teacher education.

- Third, work out a program for an effective fight against the model teacher standards and licensing act in education.

- Fourth, develop an awareness of the issues to be used in teacher education programs to make them relevant—such as materials concerning ecology and consumer education—for use in our classes, a clearinghouse type of thing, of ideas.

- Fifth, explore ways to cut down organizations such as NCATE and the interstate certification project by merging them, instead of seeing them in some ways competing with one another. I believe that we owe it to the profession to have a merged organization that is more of a national body than either one of these two are at present.

- Sixth, require that all colleges in AACTE provide a pension and an unemployment compensation plan for faculty.

- Seventh, engage teacher educators in causes which benefit the public interest in order that, as we do things we feel are worthwhile, we will provide a model for the teachers we are training.

CLEOPATRA D. THOMPSON (Dean, School of Education and Technical Studies, Jackson State College, Mississippi): My question concerns the problem of an oversupply of teachers at all levels. I wonder if we have done a good job of selling our product to the extent that we can cut down the class sizes at the elementary and secondary levels and also at the college level. We at one time said that we should have an average class size of 25, but we still see teachers carrying classes of more than that number.

The second point: We say that college classes should have an average of eight students per teacher, particularly at the graduate level, but I still see large graduate classes of more than that number. What can we do to sell the idea that we are not oversupplied, but that we need to do more to get more people into the profession?

VERNON T. GROVES (Director of Teacher Education, Olivet Nazarene College, Illinois): I wonder if AACTE could do something to promote a strategy or plan to rotate a college faculty member or professor back into the public or parochial schools, maybe rotating some of their people back up to the college in order to get us more united. Some of us may be a little stale, as those of us who work closely with the teachers know. I think maybe if the superintendents, teachers, and such were rotated into the teacher preparation areas in the colleges, maybe we could face preparing teachers in a more unified and intelligent way. Although I have been suggesting this kind of thing at the college where I teach for many years, I cannot find a way to implement it. You have to do it totally on your own by taking leave, arranging for a replacement, and covering other necessary steps. But perhaps some group could plan strategy along this line.

CHAIRMAN DENEMARK: I would like to thank our expert witnesses for their thoughtful comments and analyses of the teacher education role in the Association and to thank those members of the audience who have participated in these comments.

Performance-Based Teacher Education

J. W. Maucker
Assistant to the President
Kansas State Teachers College

I can best inform you of the origins, mandate, and *modus operandi* of the AACTE Committee on Performance-Based Teacher Education by relating a fable—a story in which the wisdom of the ages is embodied in deceptively simple form.

Once upon a time in the kingdom of Washington, a member of the Executive Committee looked up from his prime rib and asked, "What is this Performance-Based Teacher Education that the stranger from the Office of Education was talking about?" I haven't the slightest idea," his fellow member replied, "but they're certainly high on it. Maybe we should appoint a committee and issue a report on the 'State of the Art.' "

And so in due course—mid 1970's—the U. S. Office of Education agreed to provide the taxes—through Texas—and the committee was in business. It visited around and appointed subcommittees and consulted experts, as any good committee should, and by the end of 1971, was ready to pronounce. But, with 15 voices plus a staff, it was unable to hear itself think. So it enticed Sir Stanley Elam, a Scribe from Indiana, into recording what he thought he heard. The result many of you have received in a psychodelic yellow cover designed by Sir Massanari. (End of fable except for the moral.)

I have been commissioned to tell you what is in the paper so you can read it with ease. But, first, I must pay homage to the genius of the Executive Committee. It was their idea that we were to report on "The State of the Art." Such a disarming phrase—implying in five monosyllables that there is an Art somewhere in the performance-based woodwork—and it is in a State—and we are privy to the state secrets. Consider the overtones of that crisp phrase "State of the Art": highly complimentary but completely noncommittal—no crass Madison Avenue promotion and no caustic diatribe with its jealousy showing, just an even-handed, scholarly treatise to be updated periodically keeping the loyal brethern informed. Masterful.

You can judge for yourself by reading between the lines of the Foreword, Preface, and Author's Disclaimer who was not responsible for what, so I will plunge immediately into the substantive content.

First off, the committee asserts that there does exist a phenomenon loosely termed performance-based teacher education (or in some circles, competency-based teacher education) with the necessary amount of conflicting opinion among theorists, sufficient experimental applications in a variety of situations, and enough jockeying for position among educational power groups to qualify as a full-fledged "movement." Greatly oversimplified, its thrust is to shift the focus in teacher education from "learning *about* teaching" toward "learning *to teach* in the world *as she is.*" It stresses Rigor and Realism in Designing, Executing and Evaluating teacher education programs. It is *performance*-based in the sense that teaching performance on the job is the guiding focus and performance by the prospective teacher is the indicator of attainment and the guide to subsequent instruction.

The committee found many conflicting and unsatisfactory definitions of the term and wound up indicating its conception of performance-based teacher education by enumerating a series of characteristics in a rough priority order, from "essential elements" to "related and desirable characteristics." I would summarize the summary by saying that goals of instruction designed to prepare teachers, derived from analysis of teaching behavior, are stated publicly in advance of the instruction in terms of evidence regarding the students' performance which will be accepted as indicative that the goals of teacher preparation have been attained. Second, instruction is guided and individualized as much as possible through systematic feedback from frequent assessment of the degree of attainment of the instructional goals. Third, instructional assignments are considered completed only when the performance criteria are met. In addition, such instruction is usually more field-oriented than has been customary and decision making is more broadly based and more learner-influenced than in the past.

It is abundantly clear that performance-based teacher education grew out of the past and contains little that is new. Ralph Tyler was effectively stressing behavioral objectives back in the 1930's. Its present-day uniqueness lies largely in the *degree* of emphasis on *explicit* definition of objectives in evidential terms, the stress on close relationship of objectives to the actual teaching situations and, the *systematic* use of feedback and evaluation in behavioral terms. It is only fair to recognize that all of the elements have been around for years. Old Professor Dryasdust always had ultimate performance in mind, thought that the memorization of his notes had a positive relationship to performance in the classroom, required students to "perform" in the sense of passing examinations, used feedback in the form of midsemester examinations, and individualized by assigning more than anyone could read and by allowing students to pick their own termpaper topics from a list he suggested. The basic conceptions are not new; the "new" elements are largely the degree to which the assumed relationship between teacher preparation activity and the ultimate teaching process itself is made explicit and subjected to test by the use of systematic feedback to learner and instructor throughout the preparation process.

The committee became convinced that the PBTE movement is likely to have substantial *impact* because the stimulating forces reflect broad social movements in American society, particularly within the grass-roots of the teaching profession. The committee further became convinced that PBTE has definite *promise* for improving teacher education by providing a clearer instructional target to shoot at and eliminating waste in the instructional process by indicating how well the marksman is doing. It also gives promise of heightening motivation through the broader participation of teachers and students in the field.

At the same time, the committee is well aware of serious problems, issues, and concerns as a movement of this kind gets underway. Of the eight or nine examples of such problems listed in the paper, I would call your attention to three:

1. *The Scope of PBTE Programs.* There is very real danger that objectives which are not easily defined or not easily measured may be neglected. A special effort will be necessary to be sure that subjective, intangible, evanescent, but often extremely vital, goals of education are not simply lost in the shuffle.

2. *Criterion and Assessment Problems.* Reflecting the committee's concern of this point, we may quote from the report on page 22 as follows:

> Judging from modules that are currently being developed, evaluation appears to have been an afterthought. It is often crudely devised. The developers' energy, effort, and imagination have gone into producing the materials themselves, not into means of assessing mastery of them. Thus, one of the elements of PBTE that seems likely to receive only the attention that is left after other needs are taken care of is the very one that is unique to PBTE and critical to its success—adequate evaluation. Unless there is a change of focus on the part of developers—perhaps a concentration of effort involving division of labor among institutions in some kind of exchange network—and unless the federal government, seeing this as necessary, provides massive new resources and support for the creation of adequate evaluation devices as well, PBTE may well fail to achieve more than a fraction of its potential.

3. *Political Problems.* The recognition of a more explicit role in the decision making process for practicing teachers and the general public raises questions regarding the distribution and use of power which will inevitably cause stress and strain.

On balance, however, the committee feels, as it indicated in its concluding paragraph, that the advantages of PBTE make it a promising movement:

> Among the most promising (aspects) are its attention to individual abilities and needs; its focus on objectives; its emphasis upon the sharing process by which these objectives are formulated and used as the basis of evaluation; its efficiency, enhanced by the use of feedback; and its student program accountability features. These advantages would seem sufficient to warrant and insure a strong and viable movement, given intelligent leadership and adequate support for research to strengthen the thin knowledge base, particularly in the field of measurement, upon which it must rest.

So much for the State of the Art paper. There is no substitute for careful reading of its 23 pages. What of the future work of the committee?

In general the committee plans to continue to spread the word concerning this movement, to encourage and assist those who wish to participate, and to work hard for improvement of the knowledge-base underlying these efforts to develop and improve teacher education programs. More specifically, the committee plans a series of publications this spring describing PBTE programs in action and bringing scholarly thought to bear on a number of crucial issues. It further plans a series of regional conferences to involve an increasingly broad segment of the profession in discussion of PBTE. And it will continue to serve as a source of information concerning instructional materials and assessment techniques developed throughout the country.

At this point, I should like to give my own personal suggestions to fellow AACTE members in somewhat prescriptive form:

1. Enter into the dialogue. Don't ignore it. Study the "State of the Art" paper and the professional papers soon to be issued and attend conferences in your area.

2. Try PBTE in at least *part* of your teacher education program. For many institutions – probably most institutions – experimental programs with a relatively small number of students, perhaps selected on a voluntary basis, will be likely to provide the best basis for trying PBTE and evaluating its potentialities in your specific situation. If most colleges wait until they can revamp their entire program, involving all their students, before they undertake any PBTE experimentation, they will never get off the ground.

3. Do not undertake the above unless you can meet at least the following three criteria:

   a. Develop cooperative relationships and organization involving the college, one or more school districts, and the organized profession – preferably with substantial student input.

   b. Provide substantial staff time for planning and development before the program is actually put into operation.

   c. Incorporate a strong evaluation and assessment program . . . investing at least as much time of staff in definition of acceptable "evidence" and the development of evaluation instruments and techniques as in the development of instructional materials.

4. Support research and development efforts by professional organizations and associations and by the federal and state governments. Sporadic individual efforts will not get the job done.

All fables must end with a moral: "The sleeping fox gathers no moss" or, as Abraham Flexner's mother used to say, "It is harder to get rid of a rabbi than to get one." I considered the possibility of "Don't make heavy claims while skating on a think knowledge-base," but choose instead to end with Poor Richard: "A word to the *wise* is sufficient."

A Forward Look for Teacher Education

Maurice B. Mitchell
Chancellor
University of Denver

As I thought about coming here tonight, I tried to find out what a university president, a former publisher, an old communications man might say to you that hasn't been and isn't going to be said. I found it terribly difficult to find any gaps in the literature and in the current dialogue. Everything has been said about you—good and bad, lively and dull. You are the best example of "show and tell."

But I do want to say that I have great respect for you as a citizen of this country, as one who looks back over its newness and recognizes what you and your predecessors in education have done. You took a nation of strange and frightened people, fugitives from a world in which there was no real freedom, dignity, or right to pray—in which no country had ever asked them what they were going to do with their lives. They came here and invented a new way to live, and then turned, with incredibly true instinct, to the process of education to teach that concept to themselves and to their children.

No American who looks back to the heritage of this country, when he has a chance, should omit the opportunity to tip his hat to you and say thanks. I have a special qualification for saying thanks. I am a father, not just a school man; I am a parent of three children. My oldest is now 28 years old. He is practicing law in Washington, and looking back, that is a long haul and a lot of teaching and a lot of classroom time. As I look at him, he is the product of an era in American education at all levels that we may never know again. He went right through the whole system like a hot knife through butter.

I have a second one, a son who is now 19 and a freshman at Columbia in New York. When you talk to him, you spray him with ether and then you throw a net over him. He is convinced that the world is going to hell, and I'm the driver. You've had him to deal with. And I have a daughter who is 15 going on 28. She is finishing her secondary education pretty soon.

So I speak about what you do with something more than detachment. I've been going to PTA meetings as long as I can remember. I've lived through the shock of modern math and felt the humiliation a father feels today when his kids come home and he says, "In chemistry, oh yes, H_2O is water," and then they say it isn't. They talk about high transference, I valence, and all sorts of things that didn't exist when I went to school. So I am not only qualified to observe what you do, but I am highly personally involved. I am a father.

Also, I'm a drop-out. So I watch my children with some frustration. Those nights when I see them slouching around and exhort them to greater efforts, they say, "Well, how about you?" I say to them, "You don't have to go to school to be educated. You don't have to go to the university. Any man can educate himself. It is just easier and better when you're young, when you can do it systematically. Besides the difference between you and me is that you know when you're finished."

I've watched their educational world change, and I've watched our world change. And I would like to tell you what I see about the changes taking place today that seem to be of great significance to you as professionals in the education and training of teachers, and to me as an educational administrator and a private citizen and a father and grandfather. What are the forces that are changing our world?

One we don't talk about much is energy. It is a reminder. Sooner or later we may run out of the sense we have always been privileged to have in this country, that everything is without limit—you can get all the energy you want, you hit the switch and the lights come on, step on the gas and away we go. The lights won't always come on, the power people are telling us. The brown-outs are not uncommon in New York in the summer. And you may step on the gas and get the car started, but not forever. There may be a day when, stepping on the gas and starting the car, you will strangle somebody. So the whole concept of energy is changing. There are things we now know we must do, concepts of energy that may exist in the future, the threshold of new kinds of energy concepts across which we are stepping.

Biology is changing the world and medicine. I always have to remind myself that if anyone told me 20 years ago they would take somebody's heart out and stick a new one in, a retread, I would have sent for the wagon. You are training teachers to teach a generation of children who may be the first in the world with the capability to fool around with genes and chromosomes that will change the characteristics of the next generation. If that isn't a force that can change the world, I don't know what is. When you combine biology and medicine, think of what it may do to human society.

The Commission on Civil Rights, of which I am a member, thinks about that occasionally. Sometimes I think it goes beyond civil rights, into human rights. And we brood about such rights as the right not to be used as an experimental animal, which is the lot of some old folks and people in prison. We think about the right to fool around with chromosomes and to change future generations and make some decisions about mankind that may not be reversible.

Other things that are changing this world and will keep on changing it are our sensing and thinking and control. There is a whole array of resources that never existed before, that could extend the reach of our arms, our minds, multiply us, reach into outer space. The idea of reading the blood pressure of a man on the moon hints at what kind of change one has to contemplate as one thinks about the world in which we are preparing people to live and for which we are preparing teachers to teach.

Transportation. [illegible] my first jet out of here at O'Hare Field to Denver. It wasn't very long ago. Look at the revolution in transportation and the revolution we are now plotting, way beyond AMTRAK—tunnels hundreds of feet under the ground from Boston to New York, concepts of the movement of people that may change the way society lives.

The organization of human beings—human organization. We just don't function as we used to. The old organizations, the old administrative structures have long ago been outmoded by the size of us. You think of a group of men who were told by the President of the United States to get together and put something on the moon and do it on schedule. Think of the size and the labyrinth and complexity of that human organization and of the rearrangements of people that are possible for us. The management of a place like New York City (or mismanagement, depending on how you vote) is a problem in human organization and scale men have never faced before. Just the administration of health services in New York—the planning, the scheduling and training of people so that the administration of health services in one great city doesn't bankrupt it—is a great, vexing problem of human organization. This is one of the challenges of our society, one of the forces that is going to change the way people live.

Finally, there is education. Most of us have lived through these blinding 25 years since World War II, this explosion of human expectations which rest on education, the implications it has for our way of life today, for our way of life in the past, and for the kind of life we contemplate in the future. There are the cliches, the misstatements, the superficial use of the term and the intent.

I went to an NEA meeting one time in St. Louis. There was a big banner across the hall: "Education Moves Freedom Forward." Everybody cheered as the banner came down, but a few of us thought: the Russians did a great job in education; is that moving freedom forward? Are we beginning to fall down on our cliches?

It reminds me a great deal of the theory of how language developed. As one theory went, people imitated the sounds of animals. Dog went "bow-wow" so we said "bow-wow," or the dog just looked like something that should be called "dog." A Frenchman said "chien"; a German said "hund." But somehow the theory collapsed. The Russians were blasting their way into education, and who is to say that the Russians haven't moved a kind of freedom forward since those days in the '50's when they challenged us to a battle for men's minds and talked about the use of brain power as an instrument for world domination?

If you are a businessman, as I have been, and you look back over the last half of this century, you will see that the economic growth of this country has stopped coming from increased resources. There isn't that much ore left. There isn't that much more to mine, to take out of the earth, to throw into the economy as a growth factor. Where we are growing economically is very interesting to see. We are growing because we have an input into the economy of, among other things, new knowledge. Knowledge is becoming our precious ingredient. We grow because we have a labor force that is better educated than it was 50 years ago, and people who are better educated are capable of more production. I will not argue the virtues of production or no production; but I will say that when you think about education, you must think about it in terms of an enormous unmeasured contribution to the growth of this country, to the broader base of higher standards of living that not all, but many, citizens have.

And as we have seen our educated society and our scientists and technologists produce a more sophisticated society, and as we have begun to see the extra problems created—the crowded highways, the polluted air, the water that runs with filth, the strangulation of man in so many ways—we have also come to understand that we must not abandon science and technology; we must have the great power to do for mankind those things that it wants to do for itself. Then education becomes a kind of autopilot that teaches us how to live with the products of knowledge without destroying ourselves in the process. The educators are in many ways the prime movers and decision makers of that society, and a whole new kind of responsibility to prepare people for a whole new range of massive public policies and decisions now rests upon them.

As an example of how those decisions can be made carelessly, the other day somebody announced that hexachlorophene was very bad—it affected the brains of babies. I threw the Dial soap out the window and put hex down the drain. The babies in the medical schools promptly got infections, and so the nation's hospitals, fearing a runaway infection that could have killed a lot of children, went back to the hexachlorophene. The sober reminder to many people was that now we are in a world so delicately balanced that it can't run with amateurs any more. The same is true of DDT. Get rid of DDT. It killed Robin Red Breast. Also it killed the sleeping sickness bug and the malaria mosquito, and now we are beginning to see the threats of world epidemics coming through these sources. It's just not that easy.

So the forces I see changing in the world are in many ways changing the ground rules for the people who will inherit it, the people you will be training, and the people they will be teaching.

Harold Howe, who was not too long ago a commissioner of education of the United States, said to me,

> Education can fullfill its great responsibility to our developing society only if it is carefully designed to prepare students in the schools today for the world of tomorrow. And in all planning for the future of education, the preparation of educators must be given primary emphasis, since our hopes for progress ultimately depend on the competence and dedication of those who serve education—the teachers in our schools and colleges, leaders in administrative positions, a growing number of specialists, and an important number of nonprofessional helpers who make the professionals more effective.

My colleague John Goodlad puts a postscript to that. He says, "Nothing short of a complete overhaul will bring to our teacher education programs, both preservice and in-service, the vitality they must have if teachers are to effect the rapid educational evolution we want."

And a rapid educational evolution is precisely what many of us think we must have if we are going to meet and fit and match and deal with, and equip people to deal with, the kind of world I am so sketchily describing to you.

The tragedy is that at this moment in our history, when we are aware of the nature of that challenge, for the first time since the honeymoon days of Sputnik and the heart transplant and DDT and the nuclear energy discoveries, for the first time, we are surrounded by a sea of what must be described as general discontent. Some of it is in our own professional field; much of it is from our constituents, a sea of students that has surrounded us now for six long years, many of them bored, dissatisfied, discontented, rebellious, some hostile; much of it is from people we would hope would understand those problems and sympathize with them.

The Illinois State University ran a study on some of its constituents, 12,000 people, in what it called "The Teacher Surplus Survey." These people responded to a questionnaire, and one-third of those teachers, by the way, are former teachers. Here are a few of the comments made:

"Make teachers pass a state examination like doctors, lawyers, and accountants must. Also a two-year apprenticeship with reduced salary."

"Do something about those dreadful education courses. You are the victims of one of the great cliches of modern specialized education. All education courses are by nature dreadful." Many are.

"Refuse to admit weak students to teacher training programs. There are too many teachers now who don't know much more than their students. Accept only B or B-plus students. Let's get some brains into our school system. Stop offering the easy, diddley courses."

"Require education professors to teach in the public schools periodically. Make them use the methods and techniques they pour forth in the lecture hall."

I am reflecting to you what some of you may have read, the kind of public response that a public university not far from here gets when it asks people to tell them what they think about it and what it is doing and what it is doing in your field. "Disqualify teachers," they said. "There are too many drop-outs in their classes. Decrease their pay for every drop-out."

"Why are teachers allowed what almost no other profession has, absolute security, regardless of permanence? Teacher tenure should be abolished. If all the incompetent teachers on tenure were replaced with competent teachers, the surplus would again become a shortage."

"As the student is preparing to teach," one of them said, "he needs more courses on discipline and control of the class."

That is a depressing, shocking list to have somebody send you on a bright January morning.

Martin Buskin, who writes for *Newsday*, did a survey about the same time among school boards. Four school boards out of 33 he surveyed feel that teacher training institutions are doing an adequate job. 'Adequate' is the word. And their suggestions range from better screening of candidates admitted; to more student teaching time and experience; to a better job of teaching students how to teach reading, how to be better disciplinarians, and how to understand the learning process.

On the one hand, what one sees as one looks at this society is the enormous implication of education. On the other hand, at least the beginnings, or the edges, perhaps the irrational response of a society that is at the moment disaffected.

Gallup did a poll in this field last September that was published in *The Phi Delta Kappan*. Trying to get people in a jolly mood, they asked the questionnaire recipients, "What is good about education?" Well, that helped. And 21 percent of the people said, "Teachers are good." It depends which side of the statistics you are on. Fifteen percent said, "The curriculum is okay." Seven percent said, "Nothing is any good. Can't answer the question." When they were asked, "What is wrong with education that makes you unhappy about it?" the first thing 20 percent were concerned about was finance. Many people expressed anxiety about the cost of education but felt good about teachers. And 14 percent felt that facilities were an agonizing problem. Twenty percent said that one of the grave problems of the educational process is integration.

I would like to just take a couple of minutes for that one because it is a field in which I am frequently active.

Last week in New York City, I sat with my colleagues on the Civil Rights Commission—five of us—holding a hearing on the problems of the Puerto Ricans in the New York City educational system. I am not talking, now, about anything that is remote from you, because wherever you teach there are people who are in the minority—the skin is different, the way of speaking is different, the heritage is different, the language may be different. That hearing ended after two days with riots, arrests, chairs flying through the air, and general disorder. It was a sad and disheartening thing to have the first hearing of its kind in the Commission's 15-year history end in such a shabby way.

The moot testimony was the deep bitterness with which this segment of the population of New York City views its experience in education. The school population in New York City is 1,141,000; 392,000 of those 1,141,000 students are black and 260,000 are Puerto Rican—or 57 percent of the school population. The total drop-out rate for Puerto Ricans in New York comes close to 80 percent. There are 932 schools in that system, 0,228 teachers, 13,261 supervisors and administrators. There are nine Puerto Rican principals; 7.8 percent of the total teaching force is black and 1.3 percent Puerto Rican.

The Board of Examiners in New York City is the only such board in the state of New York. You must have a special examination to teach in New York City, even though you are qualified to teach elsewhere in the state. At one point, it even requires you to pass a test in which your speech patterns are a matter of concern, lest in some strange way you couldn't speak well enough to be accredited as a teacher.

Of course, when one goes back into the history of New York, one sees the acceleration of this agonizing problem. Albert Shanker, who is president of the American Federation of Teachers union in New York, testified before the Commission before the roof fell in. He observed that he had failed the speech pattern test in his day three times before he could be licensed as a teacher. That is, in his day the teachers in New York were all Irish; they got there first. Then came the deluge of later immigrants—the Italians, the Jews, the Europeans. They had a big struggle to get teaching licenses because the Irish teachers didn't want to give them up. And if you observe it coolly, in due time, whenever that is, the black teachers and the Puerto Rican teachers may get their licenses too.

I went home from New York to Denver, but I couldn't leave that problem. It has been with me ever since. It is your problem, too, just as the problem of the Chicanos, the Spanish-surnamed people in the southwestern part of the United States whose educational experiences the Commission studied last year, is your problem. There is the enormous drop-out and the tremendous bilingual problem. There are Mexican-American students in this country who are picked up because they don't speak English and described as mentally handicapped, educably mentally handicapped, and considered as children with genuine brain damage. I view that as an agonizing situation for a nation poised on the brink of great and future growth ready to soar through skies no men have ever used before. It is a problem that I must place directly in your lap.

I know that teachers get jumpy about the use of the school as a device to solve social problems, but no one is talking about that here. All I am talking about are the things we should be doing to produce the kinds of teachers that can teach the kinds of children who are increasingly becoming the majority in some segments of our country. We have the teacher who doesn't speak Spanish and won't learn it and has never been advised to learn it and the new teacher who is given the inner-city school assignment, where it takes the most sophisticated, toughest, most superbly trained teacher to deal with the problems. The seniority system lets you vote yourself out of the tough spots and into the easy ones. These are the kinds of problems that people who train educators are going to have to deal with and live with.

If we had time, I could talk to you about the black problem until morning. We are far from the end of that. I see all around me now a retreat from the commitment that many of us made not long ago, to fight this problem through to the day when every child anywhere in this country could go to school and be loved and welcomed and encouraged in his efforts to find happiness and fulfillment for himself.

I give this to you as one of the agonizing problems of a contemporary world in which teachers are being contemporarily trained. There are many others. Many of them are major policy issues that we are going to have to deal with as citizens of this country and as professionals. I would remind you that many of the problems that have plagued our society in the past 30 to 40 years, and will plague us in the future, grow out of our frequent inability to distinguish between programs and policies; we often confuse them. I call that to your attention, too.

Frequently in the preparation of teachers, we are much too ready to become custodial instead of humanistic. I make that distinction because I'm of a generation of custodial liberals. I came out of the army after World War II, saw all the problems in the distance—poverty, the racial problem, the problem of pressure on freedoms—and decided to take the custodial approach, get programs started to deal with those problems. Here we are, 25 years later. The lollypop has gone sour, and most of the programs didn't work; poverty is greater in many respects; some of the other problems are more intense; and it is now clear that another generation of Americans is beginning to deal with those problems humanistically, as people. We are going to have to make those kinds of decisions.

We are going to have to stop confusing short-term programs, for which money is always available in our field (so far), with the long-term policy. My best advice to you is to reexamine policy, not programs. The programs you can meet when the compliance test is given by the federal compliance inspector. It is a policy to make a commitment that you meet about the kinds of people you train, the way you train them, and the kinds of education you prepare them to administer when they get out into the profession.

I could go on. There is the whole field of methods and techniques, with which I spent a great deal of my time. We know far less than we should about the technique of learning. I don't know what the theory of learning is. I'm less sure about the theory of education today than I've ever been in my whole life. I don't know how sure you are, but if you are too sure, I would worry about it. There are enormous opportunities for us. If we don't take them, people will take them from us.

I view with interest the indecent haste with which performance contracts were entered into and found to be inadequate. I would love to have a look at the figures. I'm glad you aren't measured so quickly on the grants you get as the performance contractors will be on theirs. The performance contractors will not stop. The system, as they view it, isn't working. It is not economically and functionally efficient. I've heard performance contractors say, "Well, if we can't work it in schools, maybe we should consider performance contracting in teacher training. Maybe there is a richer field."

Last summer I was in Great Britain and spent 10 days at the Open University—no teachers, just teaching teams who write books and produce with the BBC television programs; there were 20,000 students, and now I suppose 30,000, teaching themselves. The image of the teacher in the classic sense in which you are often training is changing. Perhaps the change is the result of the profession's failure to pick up its opportunities, to seize its chances to step into the century in which we are living and out of the era we stubbornly refuse to leave.

We are coming to a catastrophic showdown in the financing of public education in this country. If you are thinking about that, and especially where teachers are trained and administrators are prepared to run the schools, then be prepared for somebody else. In Colorado we have a major struggle with the elimination of the real estate tax. It all sounds a little too good to be true. And the people in many cases know least about the subtle economics of the transfer of fiscal responsibility for the operation of our schools are the very people who are in them and who are running them. I offer you that as a challenge.

Of course we do so little real research and development, it is refreshing to see the Congress, even though it may not make it, trying to pass the National Institute of Education bill, and to contemplate the possibility that in this vast area, with these millions and billions of dollars that are spent, we would have directed research aimed at problems, some of them the gut problems of the learning process. Instead, what I must tell you is that there has been a pretty shoddy collection of seedy, opportunistic, self-directed research projects. It is not by accident that the School of Education at the University of Denver is not viewed with breathless awe by our mathematicians and our physicists, and our great historians and our other leaders in the various disciplines. They won't give you a Ph.D. for a dissertation on trends or projected ideas about northern Nebraska, and yet over and over again in this field I have seen performance fall far below the level of impact and service one finds and expects to find elsewhere.

I obviously stand four-square for the premise that our society is continuing to change; that the change is coming faster than it has, an impact we have not yet been able to measure in higher education; and that the system that trains our educators must do something about it. The question is, if we are going to have change, what direction does the change take? What are the methods by which change is effected, and where lies the power to make the change?

The answers to those problems, if they come from the profession, come from the people who train teachers, the people who consider ways in which the education process can be adjusted to serve the needs of contemporary society, can take advantage of twentieth century tools to deal with twentieth century problems. If they come from that source, then you will have a professional grasp of the future of the educational process. If they come from an angry, grouchy, petulant society, using its political agents to legislate changes in a highly sophisticated process that often doesn't know much, then we will all pay a high price. I think society will pay a high price, too.

There is great resistance to change; there always has been. The older I get, the more resistance I know I have to change. I hate to see a page leave the calendar. Thomas Hardy wrote a piece of poetry about that which I've always cherished because it doesn't have very many words of more than one syllable. It speaks with a sense that we have born in us—just wait, let it come. It is called "Waiting, Both." It goes something like this:

> A star looked down at me and said,
> Here I and you stand,
> Each in his own degree.
> What do you mean to do?
> Wait, I said, for all I know,
> Until my change comes.
> Just so, said the star, and so mean I.

That is man at his laziest best saying, "Let's wait."

All of these problems we talk about are tough. They change the way we live; they shake up the established order of things; they make my last motion less important, they put great pressures on me; they let fresh new faces in too soon. Wait. Yet, I am convinced that what made this particular society great is its willingness to accept changes, its willingness to swim out into unknown areas, to chart new seas, and to do new and different things.

One morning in London I turned on the BBC, and there was this lady poet. She read a few lines I've never forgotten:

> When I was young, a lonely child,
> The waves ahead looked sweet and wild.
> I lie beneath this final sheet.
> The waves ahead are not wild nor sweet.
> I did not dare to wet my feet.

Margaret Mead said that this is one of our problems today, one of our challenges. The rest of the world has blueprints to develop public education systems. We have none. We have those waves out there, with no known far shore, just a willingness to explore, to wet our feet. That you will wet your feet in the tradition of those who have come before you, I have not the slightest doubt.

Social Problems and Teacher Education

King V. Cheek
President
Morgan State College

My assignment this morning is to discuss the social issues which affect teacher education in America. I have taken the liberty to expand this topic, to include a discussion on the strategies and politics of change in teacher education, for I firmly believe that the problem which we have in teacher education and education in general is not so much of understanding the specific social, economic, or political issues which we face. I think that our real problem lies in the absence of courage or understanding of the strategies which we need to develop to effect the kind of change which most of us agree is necessary. It is for that reason that I have chosen to title this conversation, "Social Issues and the Strategies of Change in Teacher Education."

Almost any of the concerns we currently face in the education of our children and in the preparation of teachers could be included under the umbrella "social." I intend to discuss briefly only three of them and devote some attention to the general problem of promoting change. These issues or concerns are posed by three questions:

1. How important is a continuing study of the moods, attitudes, and behavior of each new student generation?

2. Which shall we pursue—integration, desegregation, or disintegration?

3. What is the special challenge of educating the disadvantaged and the culturally atypical?

I am amazed and saddened that the constituency which is the most important to us is not the subject of deep and continuing study. We cannot effectively cope with the complex environments which inspire and frustrate our children and our youth unless we also understand them. The moods of youth change from year to year and from generation to generation. We often make assumptions about what will excite them only to discover that we have been wrong. We are teaching students who in turn will teach others. Not only, then, do we need to know our constituency, but we must also understand the forces which affect the children and young people whose lives will be touched and influenced by the students we teach.

Although I have no evidence to support a conclusion, I suspect that very few colleges sponsor seminars for students and faculty on the subject of youth of today. Educators are constantly being accused by younger adults of being insensitive to change and to their needs. Much of the criticism is legitimate because we have failed to pursue the study of youth with passion and realism. We have not been hesitant, however, in making prompt judgments when we observe behavioral patterns different from those we have previously approved. This study of youth is so vital that if we neglect its pursuit we will condemn the mission of teaching to a state of mediocrity, insensitivity, and ineffectiveness.

Which shall we pursue—integration, desegregation, or disintegration? We are moving into an era which presents new challenges in human relations, challenges which profoundly affect teaching and teacher preparation. We cannot hide our heads like ostriches in the sand and escape these realities. More than any other issue, this one requires our deepest thinking—not just from the social and pedagogical viewpoint but also from a personal standpoint. On this question we cannot avoid a personal bias or attitude. Our confusion—to the extent that we are confused—will be communicated to the younger people we teach and motivate.

We must begin by recognizing that institutionalized racism in America is a fact. Our schools, both public and private, have a responsibility to combat this social and inhuman evil. Through its influence in building attitudes and destroying taboos, education can humanize America.

But we must be honest and realistic in approaching this task. The psychological value, for example, of black studies in our schools is clear. Properly approached it can remedy the long-standing deficiency in our study of history. It can in fact emancipate both black and white children and liberate their minds from the psychological enslavement of taboos. For black children, especially, an honest perspective in black studies can develop self-concepts to replace broken egos and inferior self-images. The impact upon their motivation, their drive, and their balance would be profound.

However, in this process we must avoid mythology and dishonesty. Although we can help our young people understand that black is beautiful—that black people have made contributions to world culture—we fail them unless they also understand that when they enter the real world of competition they will stand alone. Whatever they accomplish will depend upon their competence and skills and not upon what their black brothers and sisters have done.

It has been urged that real integration will be achieved only when there is no racial identifiability of any of our schools. But when we think about this, isn't it true that what is likely to happen in the whole game that we are playing is that black schools will be eliminated and replaced by all predominantly white ones with minority enrollment? Many fear that desegregation is really moving in this direction.

I recall a visit to a public high school in North Carolina. I asked a black student a question about the progress of integration. She gave me a quizzical look and replied, "We have been desegregated for five years, but we haven't yet been integrated."

I remember asking a black assistant principal, who previously was a principal of one of the black high schools in that city, about his title, and he replied to me in a murmur that he was the vice principal "in charge of buttons."

I also remember hearing several high school students remark that they awoke one morning after consolidation to discover that they no longer had a school song or a trophy case. Their history and symbols of achievement had been wiped away overnight.

We are called upon as teacher educators to prepare students to meet this challenge, to understand it, and to respond to it in a very human way. I think that we are going to make a very serious mistake, not only in teacher education but as Americans, when we fail to understand the complex phenomenon of integration and when we fail to understand that what we might be promoting in fact is not integration at all but a physical form of desegregation, and ultimately disintegration. Black and white students and teachers alike must approach this particular problem with both candor and honesty. The battle for human dignity will be fought within our schools where young children will grow and develop their attitudes about other human beings. We must be prepared to inspire young people to see each other totally in the human dimension. Only then will we realize the American dream which seeks to allow all persons to go as far as their abilities will permit.

The challenge of educating the disadvantaged and the culturally atypical is not new. However, with the impact of integration it does assume a new kind of importance. Teachers who doubt the educability of the culturally atypical and educationally deprived exist in large numbers in our schools. Those individuals who have not been trained to teach these students must be retrained or they must be removed from contact with them.

In many instances, these teachers will have to undergo more than the development of new skills and techniques. Many of them will have to undergo changes in their total attitudinal structure. Many will have to become involved in deep sensitivity confrontation in order to understand the dynamics of being involved in a teaching climate with individuals who come from a culture different from that which they previously understood. More than any other group, the teaching profession is in a position to wage war on the human and social evil of racism, and teachers can do this through the intimate contact with young minds in the classroom. This is more than a challenge, my friends. In a real sense, it is a mandate for the survival of America.

The new mood of youth, integration, the disadvantaged—these are only a few of the concerns which confront us. But of all of the challenges which we face, the need for change is the greatest.

I believe that much of our problem in higher education lies not in our ignorance of where to go but, rather, of how to get there. The literature of higher education is full of the rhetoric of change and innovation. However, we have moved slowly, much too slowly, because accomplishing change in a complex environment such as the one presented by higher education is difficult indeed. Resistances in the form of politics, vested interests, adversary-competing relationships, fears and anxieties, and just plain stubbornness have all occurred in varying forms and combinations.

We need to briefly highlight or mention the character of the change which we ought to seek. I propose four major emphases which I shall state without elaborate discussion, because any strategies for change must be understood in the dimension of the scope of the change we seek.

1. *Change which is responsive to the changing demand for teachers.* According to the "Manpower Report of the President, 1971," by 1978, new teachers required as a percentage of graduates will be 14 percent to 18 percent as compared to 21 percent in 1970, and 35 percent in 1963. This decline in the quantity of teachers demanded is acknowledged by all. We must assume more responsibility for directing students to other occupational areas and also preparing them so that their employment options are broadened.

2. *Change which produces newer kinds of teachers.* The structure and

content of current teacher education programs must be studied to explore new ways to teach and new ways to learn. If we reduce the number of teacher education graduates, we should simultaneously be concerned about upgrading the quality, about increasing the attractiveness of teaching as a profession, about eliminating it as a mattress curriculum —something for students to fall back upon if other employment opportunities are in short supply. In brief, we must be concerned to keep out the uncommitted and to bring in the sensitive student who has ability and truly wishes to teach because he or she loves students and is devoted to their personal development and who has the personality and the skills to effect results.

We know that in the past, when our students had fewer employment options, teaching provided a measure of security. This dynamic no longer obtains. Many students still select this area for suspicious and unacceptable reasons. Some who should be encouraged to be teachers are not. My concern is in developing a strategy to keep out the mediocre and the under-motivated—the person who wants to teach because he believes there is nothing else to do. We should bring in those persons who, because of their personal attitudes, abilities, and intellect, are peculiarly suited for this demanding profession.

I believe that in this moment in history we have a golden opportunity to begin the shaping of a new kind of professional teaching class. Society's greatest crime in this century has been to undervalue teachers and teacher preparation. Other educators engaged in much less important endeavors are known to look with demeaning eyes upon those engaged in this serious business of human development.

It is said that a teacher is immortal for we never know where his influence stops. He truly affects man's destiny. No other profession has the equivalent profound impact upon the character of our society. I am truly convinced that if we are to be saved, teachers will be the most important influence in this battle. For they help shape and direct the environments in which the value-building and reinforcement affecting the character of leadership take place.

Furthermore, I believe there is no other profession as demanding and yet as potentially creative. The forces and variables which confront a teacher are powerful, complex, and often puzzling. Why Johnny can't read cannot be answered with simply excuses, rhetoric, or platitudes. This is certainly not a job for lightweights or just any person who chooses it in a cavalier manner. This position leads me to suggest the next aspect of the character of change which should be explored.

3. *Change which evaluates or leads to the creation of a true professional class of teachers and teacher educators.* When we consider the nature and burden of a teacher's responsibilities and tasks, we must concede that they are just as demanding, if not more so, as those of a physician or lawyer.

Why then can't we consider a professional curriculum for teachers built upon two to four years of preprofessional education with admissions criteria which carefully screen out the unfit and with a professional degree and perhaps other criteria for entry into the profession? Surely we could not accept the notion that the work with a child's mind is any less complex than the diagnosis of a physical malady or the preparation of an estate or will.

This approach may not only solve the problem of oversupply, but it will also minimize the entry of inadequately prepared and uncommitted persons. The long-range results may prove to be astounding.

4. *Change which extends beyond the preparation of teachers to touch upon the conditions of their work environment.* Teaching as a profession must be made simultaneously more attractive and effective. Unless this is accomplished, efforts in reforming teacher preparation may have limited results.

5. *Change which places emphases upon institutional mission and commitment.* Institutional priorities, supporting attitudes, and other factors may need attention so that teacher education is placed in the appropriate perspective and receives adequate resource support.

If we are concerned about change in a comprehensive rather than piecemeal sense, then our strategies must be appropriately broad and inclusive. I shall discuss five major canons or principles of change. Undoubtedly there are more, but our time is limited.

1. Change must be planned and managed rather than permitted to occur precipitously and without regard to institutional goals and mission.

2. Strategies for change must be directed toward the culture of the institution and must seek to create a climate in which change or innovation is promoted and rewarded.

3. A strategy for change must recognize the realities of local campus politics and the roles of the various constituencies and power holders, both inside and outside the institution.

4. The fears, anxieties, vested proprietary interests, adversary roles, and other resistances to change must be appropriately reduced or eliminated entirely.

5. Planning for change should include research and evaluation so that objectives are tested and results independently audited and measured.

Each of these principles is important and all of them have an interdependent relationship.

First, change must be planned and managed. Change should not be promoted for the sake of change itself, but rather for the good of the institution and for the good of humanity.

In this all-important area of career teacher preparation, society has basic and specific needs. These must be understood in all of their dimensions. Institutions are different and diverse, and each has a specific mission or missions. This fact must be comprehended, and each institution must seek to establish its own set of priorities and goals.

The same principles of the scientific method used in advancing science and technology must be employed in the area of social and educational engineering. Careful study, accumulation of knowledge and data, testing hypotheses, evaluating results are all applicable in this important area.

The institution must begin with itself as a responsible self-critic—testing the consistency of its goals with the needs of society and evaluating the extent to which its structure and programming in fact promote the accomplishment of its objectives. When we are responsible for the lives of young people and their intellectual development, we cannot be any less but responsible—in fact we must be more so—than when we deal with machines.

The proponents of change may be impatient with the slow speed which this approach encourages. They should be reminded that in-depth studies such as are suggested here are preconditions for enduring change. In the long run the results are likely to be far more penetrating and revolutionary. Precipitous and quick behavior may yield rapid results, but in the long run, lasting progress may be slower as one becomes consumed with picking up the pieces afterward. Knowledge rather than intuition or conjecture must be the guiding force. An academic master plan must therefore precede our work.

Second, strategies must include a focus upon a change in the culture of the institution. This proposition is often overlooked and ignored, and much of the change which occurs is promoted by individual entrepreneurs. This may be the swiftest and most effective method, but the results again may be short-lived, of piecemeal and of limited impact.

Presidents come and go. Student generations are transient. Faculties usually remain. More than any others, they must be sensitized to the needs of the institution and to those of society. Their attitudes must be supportive. They are normally the implementers and often, without full knowledge of their behavior, may unintentionally sabotage an important effort.

Thus the total institutional attitudinal structure is important. There must be a climate in which the need for change is promoted, inspired, and often rewarded. This culture shock and injection is not limited to the teaching faculty but must permeate the total institution—the academic community and its related outside institutions, personnel, and constituents.

I vividly recall the attempt of one institution to change its total character away from the passive lecture-note-taking relationship and lock-step movement to a self-directed, self-pacing structure of instruction. Once the faculty accepted this substantive change, it was automatically assumed that students would be equally responsive. This institution neglected to consider that many of its students were so accustomed to a highly structured and authoritarian condition that they were unable to make the transition to the freedom of a self-directed curriculum. Their behavioral attitudes and habits—in short, their culture—were ignored.

Thus, this complex phenomenon of culture—a way of thinking and behaving—cannot be overlooked but, instead, must be carefully analyzed if change is to be effectively implemented. This factor of culture is included in the first principle, that of planning and analysis. It will also receive attention in the third principle we shall discuss—the realities of local campus politics and roles of the constituent groups as power holders and as effective change agents.

As we know, academe today is comprised of many varying interest groups and powerholders. Each of these may have a vested interest in maintaining the *status quo* or alternatively in eliminating it. Adversary relationships often arise and promote conflict even among those who ultimately seek the same ends.

Empire-building within each individual bureaucracy must cease or frustration will militate against creative reform. The generation gap, administrative bureaucracy, and faculty rigidity are also at times merely subterfuges and excuses for the varying competing groups not to listen to each other and to talk with each other about issues they jointly agree are important.

These realities must be recognized and confronted. The roles of the change agents must be clearly defined, understood, and accepted. If the objectives are all the same, then each group assuming its own unique responsibility can promote the collective and common good. The roles of each of these groups should be briefly mentioned.

The leadership role of the president is a key. He cannot be a lord and master of a plantation, initiating and making all decisions, and still expect to promote change. As a leader he has to be a catalyst, inspirer, coordinator, mover, and many other persons. He is the final authority who must keep the competing forces pulling in the same direction. Though in these times he cannot be effective as a dictator, he must nevertheless be the leader. He has the responsibility, above all others, to set a climate, an environmental tone, to delegate appropriate responsibility and to insist upon accountability among all the participants in the change process. As the intellectual leader of the institution, he will be the object of both love and hostility. In order for him to be an effective leader he must arrange the conditions of his life so that he can be a student of higher education rather than high-salaried clerk in the establishment. I am saddened to remark that the latter role is often played by far too many of us.

The faculty is considered the guardian of the academic integrity of the academy. In this role faculties have the responsibility for studying, planning, and evaluating the consistency between programs and goals and promoting the change necessary to blend the two. Involving the various orders of the faculty group in the process of change in teacher education is not an indelicate task. There is much academic snobbery among those not directly connected to professional teacher education. Their attitudes must be reoriented to understanding the awesome significance of their own neglect and to recognizing the stake they have in effective teacher education change and programming. Thus, the major priority is one of organizing the faculty as a unit to tackle the various issues involved in change.

Beyond the matter of defining appropriate faculty responsibility is the all too often neglected need for their continuing education. We may wish to consider the alternative of having faculty work for a period in the environments in which their students will be involved—either as teachers or administrators. Some kind of exchange arrangement in which the precollege elementary or secondary teacher works with the college student could be effected. The competencies and sensitivities of each of these groups would be heightened and the articulation between college and lower school education would perhaps be strengthened.

However it is structured, faculty retraining or continuing education must be a necessary adjunct to a program of change. The faculty group forms the advance guard of the change process. Their working environments and their responsibilities must be so structured that they have both the freedom and the incentive to explore and to innovate.

In the last six to seven years students realized, as did we, their tremendous and creative potential as change agents. Although they tend to be more romantic than their more experienced teachers and administrators, they often bring a fresh dimension and idealism to counter tradition-bound institutionalized attitudes.

During the decade of the sixties, they helped to create a level of awareness regarding so many deficiences in higher education. Perhaps unknown to them and often unacknowledged by us in the lesson we learned—that change can be as dangerous as tradition if made in an atmosphere of hostility and fear. All of us can vividly recall our experiences a few short years ago. When students confronted us with burning issues and demands, many of us fled to avoid an embarrassing confrontation. Our failure as administrators and faculty to be responsible left a void to be filled by alien values and often shallow programs. Instead of our stopping to study racism in our society and understanding how all of us—black and white—have been the perpetrators as well as the victims of racism, we responded by pacifying students with phoney black studies courses often taught by instant overnight experts.

Students developed their own bureaucracy which became as oppressive and as rigid as that of the establishment they attack. Many of them are not sure now what they want. But neither are we sure what is best or appropriate. The important challenge is to recognize this reality and study alternatives before decisions are made.

Students are also transient. They are with us for a very short period.

They must recognize, as must we, that what may be the fancy of one generation of students may be the poison of the next. Change must grow out of reflection of needs and sober responses and not hunches and romantic delusions. We must discover ways to blend the healthy idealism and experiences of students with our own and form a coalition which will work in an atmosphere of mutual trust and respect.

We must develop a mechanism for involving them in the teaching situation so that they use their experiences to influence change in the curriculum and modes of instruction. We will have to find creative ways for students to interact with one another, to share their experiences, for we know that they have a far more enduring impact upon each other than their teachers have on them. In this adult world of learning we must insure that everybody is a teacher and everybody is a student, for this is the only true meaning of a community of scholars.

Governing boards have a responsibility to the community as well as to the public. Perhaps their greatest contribution is in the selection of a president. In addition, their responsibility in approving major changes in policy and structure cannot be ignored. They must be enlightened, and it is our responsibility as professional managers of change to see that they are. No single strategy will work with all boards. I simply suggest that they not be ignored.

The involvement of the local educational agency cannot be over-emphasized in this process of promoting change. The ultimate result may extend far beyond change within the institution to change within the total system of education and of society.

It would also include among those as agents for change parents and community citizens. They have a vital stake and interest in what happens to their children and to their schools. They influence more than we the value-development and reinforcement of their children. We cannot conceive of teaching as the exclusive responsibility of the schools reserved for a nine-to-three period. A coalition of parents and teachers must be a powerful force in influencing any decision making process.

What is suggested here is a comprehensive approach which includes not only a sensitivity to local campus politics but also involves the forces outside the campus to decide upon, manage, and engineer change.

The fourth principle is that change can be more readily effectuated if the fears, threats, anxieties, and adversary roles among the varying constituencies are eliminated.

Although many persons profess change, their priority is stability. They feel more comfortable with tradition. They believe the future is more predictable under those circumstances. Many have made emotional investments or have created vested interest in the *status quo*. The uncertainty of how or where they will fit into a new structure or a new world heightens anxieties and fears and creates resistances. The most difficult and critical problem confronting the engineers of change is the one of creating an institutional sensitivity which overrides one's personal or vested selfish interests.

The teaching profession, for example, is one of the most protected in the world. Tenure systems have gone far beyond providing mere security. They now protect the incompetent. Peer group professional judgment is a rare phenomenon, and time spent becomes the dominant criterion for gaining permanent employment. This is just one example of how our selfish motives become more important than the learning in our schools and colleges. I am not arguing against tenure. However, I would insist that it is moral only among moral and professional men. And I am saddened to say that professional morality and responsibility do not appear to be on the upswing.

Unions are here and will soon be entrenched. Change will become far more difficult unless unions are also coopted as allies rather than viewed as adversaries. We may moralize and philosophize about this phenomenon, but it is a human reality which must be confronted if change is to occur. Though we may not like it or consider it outside our responsibility, we must ease the personal burden of change held by those who have been around for some time. It is not appeasement, but it is a necessary condition and a necessary step which we must face.

I will not suggest in this discussion specific ways to accomplish this. Believe me, I know that we have to confront and to solve this problem many times over. However, in some instances the choices are not there and conflict may be inevitable. Whenever it is, we must simply be certain that the virtues of change can be established, and we must be prepared to rest our case upon that fact alone rather than upon personalities. When the lives of our children are at stake, any personal vested interest must be expendable. The use of a master plan to accomplish and execute change will also minimize this kind of problem.

Beyond the factors of fear and selfish interests lie the problems of adversary relationships both within and outside the university. Teachers manipulate each other as well as students in ways they believe that they are being manipulated. Defenses are erected and honest dialogue about common objectives is muted.

If we are to pursue common goals, we must understand the need for cooperative effort. Perhaps the best place to begin is with ourselves. If we expect our students to acquire the values of working together, of morality, and of correct behavior, we must first acquire some ourselves so that they see us as model figures worthy of emulation. Any strategy for change must cope with this problem so that constituent groups are not working at cross-purposes.

The fifth principle is fundamental but often overlooked. It is that change should always be accompanied by research and evaluation. Behavioral objectives must be defined and they must be measurable. If change is not to be viewed as a one-shot affair, it must also be approached as a continuing commitment. A capacity or capability as well as an attitude for change must be developed. Research and evaluation will also help promote this end.

This brief discussion has been neither definitive nor exhaustive. There are many more principles which must be considered in planning change. The ones I listed here must be considered along with all of the others.

I emphasize that in the area of teacher education our vision must not be limited. We must not only continue to seek new ways to teach and learn, but perhaps we must consider a totally new structure with a new set of conditions and assumptions. This demand has a special relevance for teacher preparation. We cannot afford the luxuries of other disciplines and professions. If Johnny cannot read, then we must take the initiative—ask why not and proceed to seek the solution.

We may be faced with the choice of "remodeling the chapel or reforming the church." I submit we may be forced to do the latter. Those institutions which do not perceive the inevitability of change may in the final analysis find themselves saddled with the epitaph of the dinosaur: "I do not know why the dinosaur became extinct. All I do know is that something changed and the dinosaur didn't."

This is our choice. We have little to lose and we may insure our future survival.

Education and the Federal Dollar

The Honorable William Proxmire
Democrat, Wisconsin
United States Senate

All of us know that from the days of Homer, when there was no written tradition, through the Middle Ages, with sporadic pockets of educated monks preserving our Western heritage from the barbarian flood, until the present, the hallmark of a civilized society has been the educational level of its people.

The ability to read and understand a great novel, the enjoyment that comes from a fine piece of music, the perspective we gain from learning of different times and different peoples – these are more than just the embellishments of an educated mind. They are the sum and substance of a meaningful existence. They differentiate the civilized man from the animal or vegetable.

Yet when we confront the hard economic realities of everyday living we are forced at least to quantify the benefits we receive from dollars spent on education. We do not like to do this – to put it in material terms – because education is so much more than can possibly be expressed in material terms. I think that our young people are giving us a number of messages, and one of them is that perhaps we have been too materialistic. And many people, I think, would say that the benefits of education are far more than the material benefits.

When you are dealing with parents, with a state legislature, or with the federal Congress, you have to be pretty concrete and specific in terms of the dollar benefits and the dollar costs.

At any rate, few parents urge a child to go on to college so that he can sharpen his appreciation of the finer things in life. Some do. When we send our sons and daughters to college many like to think that we are buying them a somewhat more material benefit for the money spent, and the cost goes up each year.

But if this is true of parents, how much more true is it of the federal government, Congress, and the taxpayers who are not far behind members of the Congress? Uncle Sam is confronted with a multitude of demands for the tax dollars you pay into his pocket – all the way from indemnity payments for honeybee farmers to support for a Mars probe. In order to merit a cut of the federal pie, the educational community must show substantial benefits for dollars spent.

Are federal dollars wisely spent on education? Although it may be unpopular to direct attention to this fact, the federal government undoubtedly wastes a great deal of money it does spend on education

It makes mistakes. For example, yesterday's emphasis on the physical sciences—an almost exclusive emphasis for a number of years and particularly in engineering—through the National Defense Education Act is reflected in today's unemployment rolls. Federal funds spent on massive, impersonal school dormitories might better have been spent on more and better teachers to combat student alienation and to recognize the old adage that the best school is Mark Hopkins on one end of a log and the student on the other end. Hundreds of millions of dollars go each year to elementary and secondary schools because the students attending those schools have a parent working for the federal government. Fairfax County, Va., for example, receives federal money because my press assistant's children attend its schools. Arlington, Va., receives a federal handout because my administrative assistant has children in its school system. Some of the wealthiest counties in the country—Washington, D. C.'s bedroom suburbs—receive lavish amounts of so-called impacted area assistance under this foolish educational program.

But I must quickly add that money spent wisely on education brings perhaps a greater return than we can anticipate from any other investment. As Chairman of the Congressional Joint Economic Committee, I am particularly interested in what economists call "benefit-cost" ratios—that is, the return in benefits as measured in dollars that can be expected from a given investment of federal money. In the past we have done very little of this kind of analysis. As a result, we have appropriated money in areas where the political power is, where the political push is, and where the political appeal is. We have given in to vested, established groups, maybe labor unions or maybe big corporations, which put pressure on Congress to spend the money; we might better have evaluated where the money will give the best return. It is too bad from the standpoint of education because the benefit-cost ratio we can chart out for an investment of education is truly impressive, both in the public and the private spheres.

Let us ask ourselves: How much is an educated people worth to a country? What is the real basic resource of any country? What really makes a country strong? Is it physical size? Population? There are bigger countries than the United States in size and certainly bigger countries in population, as the President's trip to China reminds us. Factories, agriculture—each of these things is important; but, really, what makes a country strong? It is the training and education of its people that is the fundamental resource. The strength of a country is determined by the skills of the people who make up that country.

Let us consider some of the ways to measure the value of our country with federal investment in education. Here are some examples. Education increases earning power with a consequent increase in federal tax revenues. In this way education can be said to pay for itself. One study has estimated an increase in federal individual income taxes as high as $406 a year in some groups because of the added value of a college education. We might ask ourselves, should we spend money on education? We have to ask ourselves this question in Congress all the time. More money in education or more money on defense? That is a tough choice you make. You can't spend more money on both, because we are right at a definite limit. Which should have the top priority? Well, the fact is that education sharply improves our defense capabilities. Dollars spent on education are in a sense dollars spent on defense, I'm talking about general background, not just scientific training. With increasing technology, an educated military is more important than ever. We must have men who know how to operate the new machinery of defense. We must also have a class of soldiers who are intelligent enough to handle power without abusing it, especially as a volunteer army.

Education increases our internal strength as a nation. An informed electorate is the best insurance against demagoguery and anarchy. A highly educated people is much more apt to solve problems by making, not breaking, laws.

Education is a direct contributor to increased industrial productivity. In other words, education makes a vast contribution, even to the economic health of a nation. Without productivity gains made in the past, we would long ago have fallen behind every other country in international trade because of our high wage scale. The latest international crisis is, in this sense, as much a challenge to our educational system as to our economic process.

What hard dollars-and-cents indications do we have of the value of an education? Let's look at a few.

The median value of a family whose principal wage earner has had four years of college in 1967 was $12,672. The median income for all families was $8,168 while the median income for those headed by a high school-educated wage earner was $8,822. Thus, a minimum of four years of college is worth $3,850 per year. Assuming a working career of 40 years, total benefits to a family would be an amazing $152,000.

Benefit-cost studies of the rate of return to the individual from investment in a college education place the rate of return at between 12 percent and 15 percent. The rate of return, then, is far above the rate the government expects from its other expenditures. This rate of return on the average in government is about 8 percent. On Corps of Engineers projects it is around 3½ or 4 percent. So, if we determine where our money went on the basis of where we would get it back, ignoring the humanizing elements and ignoring the fact that we want to be an Athens and not a Sparta, we would invest far more in education and far less in public works.

For example, the Illinois Waterway Project, which cost $200 million in tax dollars, had a rate of return of 2 percent. In 1968 we had a controversy over the Trinity River Project. That is a project to build a canal from Dallas and Fort Worth to the Gulf of Mexico. Some people said it would be cheaper just to move Dallas and Fort Worth to the Gulf of Mexico. The project cost us well over $1 billion; the return was around 3 percent. And, of course, we are spending money on that kind of project consistently.

What is the return that we get on our investment in the space program? The space program has much appeal, especially for our young people.But I think if we consider how we invest money in the space program, particularly what the scientists tell us, that we can get as much in terms of scientific knowledge by instrumented space travel as by man traveling in space at one third of the cost; we can see that the expenditures now on space shuttle, for example, have a very small return on any kind of measurable basis. As a matter of fact, the space agency cannot tell us. I've written the space agency: "Can you give me a cost-benefit analysis?" They wrote back: "Senator, we can't even give you a benefit analysis." I ask: "What are the benefits of the space program?" They reply: "There are two benefits, one, the knowledge of our solar system is developed; and two, a psychic satisfaction comes from watching man land on the moon and make other space adventures." Well, this is something that shouldn't be ridiculed or demeaned; obviously, if has a magnificent future and great achievements, but in terms of trying to measure where we should put a very limited amount of resources, it seems to me that this must take a back seat to education.

Then, there is the highway program. When I came to Washington in 1957 there were two programs whose futures were being charted: the space program and the highway program. In both cases the President of the United States—President Kennedy until 1961 in regard to the space program and President Eisenhower in respect to the highway program—determined they would have top priority. They both achieved enormous success, but neither effort can compare in benefits, significance, and vital importance to the nation's well-being with education. Yet they were given superior priority.

The education rate of return is better than the rate of return in the private sector, and that cannot be said of most government investments. Although there are no very reliable overall statistics on the benefits to society of a higher education, the noted economist, Carl Kaysen, put it beautifully I thought, when he said:

> Many of the arguments that justify public provision of primary and secondary education can easily be extended to training in arts and sciences at the college level. No particular group of users short of society as a whole can be said to get the benefits of those activities, and therefore society as a whole should support them.

Is the federal government doing enough? This year, at a time when college enrollments are estimated to have increased by 440,000 young men and women, the Office of Education plans to cut its support for higher education by approximately $384 million. The overall budget for the Office of Education will be somewhat higher than it was last year, $276 million higher, to be exact, if the President's budget recommendations are approved by the Congress. However, higher education is cut back and the increase overall is very limited. I do not think, as a matter of fact, that it takes into account the inflationary elements.

I took a look at what the budget for fiscal 1973 (the year beginning in less than five months) called for with regard to education professions development, an area in which I know you have a special interest. As I went through the various budget documents, a comment made in January's report by the National Advisory Council on Education Professions Development—a fine report that I intend to refer to later—came to mind. I'd like to read it to you:

> The turnover of personnel who direct federal education activities is substantial. All too often, changes of personnel in the Executive Branch are accompanied by the promulgation of new priorities or the institution of new programs. This results in confusion and frustration on the part of those who direct projects in the schools or colleges.

Let's compare this statement with the comments made in a briefing document on funding for "Educational Renewal," a new category of funding that includes many programs traditionally provided for through the Bureau of Educational Personnel Development programs that directly affect you.

> On January 10 Commissioner of Education Marland announced "A U.S. Plan for Education Renewal." He cited President Nixon's call for educational reform in 1970 and indicated that the Office of Education has developed an educational renewal strategy designed to help American schools reform themselves.

If these constant changes of direction are confusing to you, I can assure you that they are no less so to the Congress, particularly when it comes to finding out what plans the administration has for funding existing programs under the latest "new initiative." But let me try to give you a little information on what fiscal 1973 may hold in terms of federal budgeting for Education Professions Development if the Nixon budget is approved by the Congress.

Funding for the Teachers Corps would remain at last year's level of $37,435,000.

Funding for Education Professions Development—pegged at $7 million last year—would be eliminated. On the other hand, appropriations for Career Education Personnel would be increased by $3.1 million to $10 million. To further confuse the situation a category know as "Other Personnel Development" would be subject to a cut of $3.9 million to a figure of $4 million. I hope that later budget documentation will clear up this very cloudy picture.

A new renewal site program which proposes to expand the urban-rural approach of concentrating training resources on a single school would be budgeted at $30.2 million, an increase of $28.2 million, almost fifteen-fold over the $2 million provided last year. Apparently what is going to happen is that the personnel development fund will provide the Corps funding for renewal sites. Other project grant funds will be gradually added.

Appropriations for bilingual education would be upped under the proposed budget to $41,130,000 from the current $35 million.

Dollars for career opportunities and urban-rural programs would increase by $2.9 million to a total of $39.6 million, if Congress approves the recommended budget.

To quote again from the report of the National Advisory Council on Education Professions Development,

> There is one observation about federal activities in education that can be made with considerable confidence: the resources needed to produce effective results in any given setting or project have, in general, been substantially underestimated.

How do we know that federal support is inadequate? A study published last July by the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges indicated that more than half of our state institutions of higher education could do no more than maintain the *status quo* unless additional resources were found to deal with constantly escalating costs and needs. Some public colleges and universities have had to dip into general reserve and endowment funds. Others have had to borrow large sums for operating costs and at least two—Rutgers and Cornell—went into their endowment principals last year and still ended up with deficits.

But how about private schools? The private university picture is bleaker yet. An Association of American Colleges study, released last September, predicted that 365 of our 762 private colleges and universities—just about half—will run out of liquid assets if current deficits continue and no outside help is received from state and federal governments.

A Carnegie Commission study titled "The New Depression in Higher Education" comes to these conclusions:

- 540 institutions of higher education, public and private, enrolling more than 20 percent of the nation's college students are considered to be in financial trouble.
- Another 1,000 schools containing 56 percent of all college students are categorized as "heading for financial trouble."
- A mere 800 schools with 23 percent of our college population are rated as "not in trouble."

Yet, as I indicated earlier, at a time when college enrollment has jumped by 440,000 in a single year, the federal government plans to cut its support for higher education by $384 million.

Let me ask: Are federal education dollars distributed fairly? Distressed as I am over the failure of federal financing, I am equally concerned about recent indications that federal programs to give lower-income youth an opportunity to attend college have failed dismally.

An analysis of federal subsidies to undergraduate education was prepared by my own Joint Economic Committee, aided by economist David S. Mundel; that study has not been released but I am going to release part of it here to you tonight. The study indicates that we are not giving nearly enough attention to the qualified student who cannot afford to go to college without outside help. The Mundel study shows that the average federal student subsidy for 1966-67 was $358 for a student whose family earned between $4,000 and $6,000 a year and almost as much—$350—for a student whose parents earned over $30,000 a year. In other words, we are providing virtually the same subsidy for the wealthy as for the poor. The real losers were the students from the lower middle-income families. They received the least federal help. If your family income was between $8,000 and $10,000 a year—and that takes in a very large proportion of American families—your college-bound son or daughter would have received an annual federal subsidy of $280, or $70 less than the child of parents in the over $30,000 income bracket.

The subsidies under study came from institutional-aid programs, Internal Revenue Service dependency allowances, Social Security benefits and the federally guaranteed student-loan program.

The Mundel report concludes: "A policy of direct grants (to college students) maximizes the potential equality of opportunity impacts of federal resources."

It is very easy to talk about the immense needs our educational systems have for additional funding but it is very difficult to determine from where that funding might come. If you are in a local situation, you turn to the state government; if you are at the state institutional level, you turn to the federal government. Well, how about the federal government? The President is said to be considering a Value Added Tax as a replacement for local property taxes in financing public elementary and secondary education. Frankly, I am completely opposed to such a scheme. The Value Added Tax, or VAT as it has come to be known, is nothing more or less than a national sales tax—a tax which would fall most cruelly upon the shoulders of the poor. It would tend to erode the sales tax structure that the states have relied on. It would be a regressive tax with a vengence.

Where, then, do we find the needed dollars to support a greater educational effort? Let's take a look at the budget. In the fiscal year that ends June 30 we will witness a budget deficit of at least $38.8 billion, the worst since the Second World War. The only three years in the history of this country that had a bigger deficit were the years of the Second World War when 50 percent of everything we produced went into the war effort. This $38.8 billion is the current official estimate. It could get worse, and it is getting worse. As a matter of fact, the initial estimate was for an $11.2 billion deficit in fiscal 1972. Then in fiscal 1973, the next year beginning July 1st, the deficit is now estimated to moderate somewhat but still will be in the vicinity of $25 billion. If the track record is the same on that as it was in the 1972 budget, that is, if the estimate is as far off, we will have a $75 billion deficit at the end of this coming year, or $80 billion.

Furthermore, according to the budget document, most of the expenditures planned for fiscal 1973 are uncontrollable. They cannot be moved around because they are committed. The federal government has a legal and moral obligation to pay them—they are fixed costs. These costs include social-security payments; nobody would cut those. In fact, Wilbur Mills* wants to increase them 20 percent. Social security payments are already $46 billion. Medicare, unemployment, and retirement payments amount to $22 billion; they cannot and will not be reduced. Veterans benefits are $8.7 billion and this figure is not going to be reduced in any way, shape, or form. Interest on the national debt runs $21 billion; there is no way you can reduce that. If we include outlays from prior-year contracts and obligations—costs that I do not consider as fixed as the administration does—the total of what the budget refers to as "relatively uncontrollable outlays" come to $174.6 billion. That leaves us with controllable outlays to move around—money that we could shift from one program to another—of $79.8 billion, less than a third of the national budget.

Given this bleak picture, what are our alternatives? We could increase federal spending and thus further unbalance the budget. This I think is irresponsible; I oppose it, and I believe most thoughtful citizens oppose it.

We could redistribute federal spending. We are limited by the fact that only $79.8 billion, according to the administration, is controllable or could be shifted from one program to another without violating fixed or legal agreements. Nevertheless, I believe that there is wasteful fat in this $79.8 billion which could successfully be diverted into high-priority programs such as education and could thereby provide the kind of improvements for educational funding we need.

Where is the fat? Take a look at controllable outlays and consider this: almost two-thirds of our controllable expenditures in fiscal 1973 will be spent on national defense, notably in the military area. If we could realize cost economies of 10 percent in our projected defense budget for the next fiscal year we would have an extra $8.2 billion to spend on more important programs, such as education; to return to the taxpayer; and to reduce the national debt.

I am convinced that we in the Congress can hold the defense budget down to last year's levels if we really want to. This would result in a savings of $6.3 billion.

Let me give you some examples. First let me say, we do not live in a Sunday school world; I am not one who believes in unilateral disarmament. I think we must have a strong defense and we must have a defense that can meet anything that the Russians can achieve. We must have a defense that offers a complete, effective, and persuasive deterrent. But consider what the situation is in the military.

Number one: we have already had a reduction in Vietnam spending of $16 billion. The marginal expenditures in Vietnam two years ago were about $24 billion a year, annual rate; now they are about $8 billion. This is a $16 billion savings.

We now have a much higher pay scale for military personnel, as evidenced by the most recent pay hikes that went into effect. We have studied that. There is no higher pay overall because we have sharply cut down the number of military personnel. We had three and a half million people in the military. Now we've got 2.4 million. The result is that the pay has not gone up overall, even though individual members of the armed forces are receiving much higher pay.

But there are areas that we really can cut. We have a new fighter plane called the F14. The F14 is a fighter plane manned by one pilot who is also navigator, gunner, everything. It is a plane that operates from an aircraft carrier. It is a plane that is supposed to be equipped to meet the Russian Mig. The Russian Mig costs $800,000. This new F14 is supposed to replace the F4 which costs $4 million. The F14 costs $15 million for each plane, and they hope to build several hundreds of those planes at a cost of literally billions of dollars. The F14 has all kinds of problems. It is not as maneuverable as the F4. The fighter pilots who handle it say they would much rather handle the F4.

---

*Democratic Congressman from Arkansas.

Number two, it carries missiles which are enormously expensive. Those missiles are so heavy that if the plane comes in to the aircraft carrier when the sea is rough, the missiles have to be jettisoned. And when you jettison those missiles you drop $2,400,000 right in the ocean.

But the main reason is because the F14 is designed to meet a purpose, which is really ridiculous: to enable the aircraft carrier to meet and defeat Russian planes which are land based in order to meet a Russian nuclear threat and protect our aircraft carrier in the process.

I submit that, no matter how the Navy may struggle to justify building new aircraft carriers or using them to confront nuclear power, it is ridiculous. We live in a missile age. We are now able to design any ballistic missiles that are able to shoot down any incoming missiles—even those the size of a suitcase—at the rate of 17,000 miles an hour in outer space. We have missiles that can shoot them down and get close up to them and knock them out.

Now, how does an aircraft carrier fit into this kind of a world? An aircraft carrier is as long as three football fields. It does not travel at 17,000 miles an hour; its maximum speed is 50 miles an hour. It does not come in from outer space; it has one altitude—sea level. As one senator says, it is like hitting a bull in the butt with a bull fiddle. You just cannot miss it. And yet we are building more aircraft carriers and we are devoting literally billions of dollars to build this enormously complex fighter plane to make the aircraft carrier able, theoretically, to confront a Russian nuclear threat. It makes no sense.

We have to reduce our manpower. We still, however, have well over 2,400 overseas bases, far more than any nation has had in human history. We have hundreds of thousands of people stationed all over the world in addition to the men we have in Vietnam. We have, for example, 320,000 troops in Europe—more than 25 years after the end of World War II. How long are they going to stay there? They were there because the free European countries were relatively weak after World War II. These countries needed to be defended against the possibility of Russian aggression, but now those European countries have a population bigger than Russia and their combined economy is more productive than Russia. I am not saying we should pull out or be isolationists. We certainly should provide the nuclear umbrella and the air and naval support, but it is about time the European nations provided a substantial proportion of the manpower. We could withdraw 150,000 troops and save billions of dollars in the process.

Let me touch on one other area. I am Chairman of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee. I was responsible for the recent foreign aid bill, and I fought hard trying to reduce the amount for foreign military assistance. Think of what just happened in the recent war between India and Pakistani: both sides equipped with American arms, American tanks on the side of the Indians, American tanks on the side of the Pakistans, American planes and American bullets, American bombs killing Indians and killing Pakistanis. Does it make any sense at all? It certainly made no sense to anybody observing, and I cannot find a thoughtful observer, outside of the

Pentagon, who would tell you that the Pakistanis would be able to defend themselves against either a Russian or Chinese attack, no matter how much we provide them with arms.

Our military foreign assistance program is just a useless and wasteful program that ought to be phased out.

Our military foreign aid program altogether, we have been told, is a program of about $2½ or $3 billion. That is true if you include the economic assistance and only a small part of the military assistance. But what is concealed, however, is that most of the military assistance program is not covered in the foreign aid program. Most of it is funded by the Defense Department and by other means.

It was a fascinating experience last year when I tried hard to determine from the State and the Defense Department how much we're spending on military foreign aid altogether. It took three solid weeks and the figures I got were conflicting. Finally I had to ask the General Accounting Office to make an accounting of it; we finally determined that we were spending over $6 billion a year on military foreign aid. It seems to me that most of this $6 billion can certainly be saved. Some of it perhaps can be defended, but most of it is just plain wasteful.

There are many other areas for possible cutting. We could, for example, save a great deal of money in pork barrel publicworks programs. This year when higher educational expenses are being cut back, public-works programs are being increased by 40 percent. A small item but an item nevertheless that I can't resist citing is the Subversive Activity Control Board, an agency established in 1950 for the purpose of exposing Communists that has yet to expose a single Communist, an agency which rarely meets, an agency which has five commissioned Board members, each of which gets $36,000 a year for doing nothing, and an agency which has only had about two hearings in the last two years. The budget of this agency is going to be increased 57 percent in the coming year.

There is the highway program. The way we are going on that program, we can cover the whole country with concrete in the next two years. The program certainly should be cut back.

Let me conclude by looking at how you, your colleagues, and other educational professionals—as well as we in the Congress—might make current dollars invested in education, meager as they are for many purposes, go further. It seems to me that the recent report of the National Advisory Council on Education Professions Development makes some particularly helpful suggestions. Let me touch on a few.

The report commented on the fact that the Bureau of Educational Personnel Development "has taken the position that the design and implementation of training programs for educational personnel who staff elementary and secondary schools should be determined by the university, the school system, and the community acting under an arrangement of parity." The report called for an elaboration of this policy. This is a timely request. There are encouraging examples of this type of coordination the Bureau apparently has called for. The Kanawha County, W. Va., program is a good example. At the same time, as I'm sure you know better than I, it is often extremely difficult to overcome parochial jealousies that have existed for years among these groups. To avoid power plays and to attain a truly balanced and fair training program for elementary and secondary teachers requires careful and sensitive guidance—guidance that the Office of Education ought to, at least, attempt to give.

The Advisory Council report also suggests that the Congress, particularly the Senate, more adequately staff its appropriations committees so that the various subcommittees, especially in this instance, the Labor-Health, Education and Welfare Subcommittee, could give closer scrutiny to agency policy. This is a theme I've been playing for many years now. How can we in the Congress expect to ride herd adequately on federal spending, especially wasteful federal spending, without adequate staff? At this time there are only two professional Senate staff personnel to oversee the more than $88 billion budget for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education and Welfare. *Only two men* to oversee the $88 billion expenditures when we make the laws and determine the policy.

The Advisory Committee report states that "the most creative response to Congressional intent will result if statutes related to the training of educational personnel identify broad purposes and accord to the Executive Branch the latitude needed to indentify problems, develop strategies, and establish priorities." I'm glad to say that the Education Amendments of 1972, which we took up on the floor of the Senate this week, do exactly that by not only extending the the Education Profession Development Act for four years but also providing for a single $600 million authorization rather than earmarking designated amounts for specific purposes. The act is not wholly permissive in this area, let me hasten to add, because it does provide that at least 25 percent of the money must be used for the Teacher Corps and at least 5 percent must be used for teacher fellowships.

In conclusion, a great deal remains to be done to make a fine education available to all Americans, regardless of financial capability. In order to accomplish this goal we have to provide more funds. I say that as one who is identified in Washington as one who believes in cutting spending, but I think here is an area where we need to increase spending. It is the best investment a human being can make in his own future. We've always thought of families as making sacrifices and borrowing money to educate their children. You say, "That is a wonderful family. That is a family that is going to make great contributions to the community. That is a family to be proud of." We're always proud of a city that has the willingness to invest in better schools and which pays better salaries to its teachers. That is always a sign of a good progressive city. In Wisconsin I am very proud of the investment we have made in education. In relationship to our income it ranks near the top among all the states in the country. Why shouldn't this be true of the country? Why shouldn't this be the best indication of a country that really understands its human responsibilities and wants to invest constructively in its future? It should.

It is clear we must reorder our priorities to provide the deserving but poor student an educational break. We must eliminate wasteful expenditures on education programs, such as aid to federally impacted areas. We must take a good hard look at the proposed $6.3 billion increase in defense spending. We must do our best to see that the dollars are provided to make this more truly a land of equal educational opportunity.

China: A Government and a People

Seymour Topping
Assistant Managing Editor
The New York Times

Regardless of what the communique to be issued in less than 36 hours says, the Nixon visit to China was successful before it began. To have a President go to Peking to establish a channel of communication is a remarkable thing, and I think a great diplomatic and humanitarian achievement. It is incredible that for a period of more than 20 years we have not been talking to a country which contains one-fourth of the world's population. Just to have the channel of communication open, at least partially, is indeed a tremendous achievement.

There are some aspects of this visit that will not appear in the communique simply because they would be an embarrassment to other countries—notably about the Soviet Union, Japan, and Nationalist China. But from the Chinese point of view, the reasons for entering these talks relate very much, not only to their relationships to these countries, but our relationships. I would like, therefore, to go back to the origin of this visit, at least from the Chinese point of view.

This was not a visit that happened to be arranged because the Chinese, with an excellent sense of humor, decided to use ping-pong balls. The visit was carefully planned, and the Chinese actually began to work on it as far back as 1968. They were interested in Richard Nixon. They had seen an article published in the *Foreign Affairs Quarterly* in 1967 in which Nixon talked about the need to bring China into the world community and open communications with that country. Although hardly a conciliatory offer, it showed that his mind was open for an exercise of diplomacy. Soon after he became President, the Chinese—through a private channel probe—began to see whether or not it would be worthwhile to sit down and talk to this new President. As you know, the President had also on his part, within two weeks after he was installed in office, begun communications through third parties—through Roumania, France, and Pakistan—to see whether or not the two countries could be brought together. There would have been an exchange of some kind much earlier than this if there hadn't been the invasion—in my opinion disastrous—into Cambodia by South Vietnamese and United States troops. A visit or at least an exchange of some kind between the United States and China would have taken place much earlier.

For the Chinese, the thing that prodded them more than anything else into a desire to talk to the United States was the change in the balance of forces in the world, and that relates to the fact that by 1960 the International Communist Movement had been completely fragmented. The ideological dispute had become such that all of the national antagonisms between China and Russia—which go back for centuries and which relate to the fact that the Russians are on a part of what the Chinese consider a very sizable piece of their territory in central Asia and northeast China—came out and erupted finally into a severe border dispute, clashes which took place in 1969. These clashes were of a very serious nature. You can judge it by the fact that the Russians massed somewhere between three-quarters of a million and a million troops in Central Asia. In point of fact, there were more Soviet military power and troops concentrated in Central Asia than in Western Europe. The Russians accepted the fact—as they do today—that their most dangerous enemy and the country with which they most likely will get into a war is not the United States but China.

At one point in 1969, as these clashes were taking place all along the border, the Russians let it be known in a very delicate and discreet way that, if the Chinese kept pressing up against the border, the Soviets must undertake a nuclear strike against China. We can't say whether or not that was a real threat or just a bluff, but it was enough to tell the Chinese how dangerous the situation was and make them aware of the fact that they were virtually naked to Soviet attack. The Chinese have a good army, though much smaller than the Soviet army. It is an army of 2,800,000 men compared to three-and-a-half million on the Russian side; but they have nothing to compare with Soviet or, for that matter, American nuclear striking power, nor will they have such capability on any large scale really to prepare for the balance of the century.

Shocked by the Russian attitude, the Chinese entered into negotiations. It was not a negotiation that was going to be fruitful; it was pretty much in my opinion a very important stalling action for the Chinese. In all the territorial differences, they were particularly concerned about a large part of Central Asia which had been taken over by the Russian Czar in the 18th Century. The Chinese said they were willing to recognize the present border, the *de facto* border, if the Russians would agree to make a declaration that the Czarist treaty which established the present borders was unequal. The Russians, of course, have not been willing to do that.

They knew that if they did, it might be an invitation to trouble in the future. With all of Northern Siberia and Central Asia, a vast empty expanse of land, and with this tremendous Chinese population pressing at the borders, totaling perhaps more than a billion Chinese by the end of this century, the problem worries them a great deal. So they refused to come to an agreement of that kind. I think the Chinese anticipated that.

Meanwhile, the Chinese went to work on a number of things. They began the speed-up of their nuclear capability. They were able last year, for the first time, to place at the Soviet border a medium-range missile, and recently we've learned they have been able to establish intermediate-range missiles, which means that from some parts of China their missiles can reach Moscow. I do not think they have any illusions about the fact that they have just a very puny nuclear capability compared to the Soviet Union. But they regard the capability nonetheless as an important deterrent force.

The Chinese did a number of other things. In every large- and medium-sized city extensive underground shelters were built, involving large tunnelling where the population could go, with communications, lighting, food storage, and everything else. I saw some of these tremendous air raid shelters. In one machine tool factory, for example, I saw enormous underground shelves being made in which workshops would be put down into that shelter. They also went to work in putting in emergency food storage. I saw that in the countryside as well. They have undertaken decentralization of industry for economic as well as for military reasons so that, if they come under attack, no matter what devastation is visited upon any part of the country, they can continue to function and work in another part of the country.

Then they did something else. They changed their international policy, and they began to make a probe in the direction of the United States. They estimated, and I think quite correctly, that if they could establish some kind of relationship with the United States, making the Russians sufficiently uneasy, the Russians would know they might have to possibly contend with two antagonists on two flanks, the east and the west, and this would make it less likely that the Russians would attack them. This motive was one of the underlying reasons, among many other reasons, for the Chinese movement toward us.

On our part, the attitude of the President was really in some ways not so different, although we were not as fearful as the Chinese were of an attack. Richard Nixon understood that suddenly the world had gone very tight and the balance of forces were such that a great deal could not be done to dramatically change the world situation. There was only one chessman that could be moved on the international board—the Chinese. He moved that chessman and it is already working: the Russians will be a lot more forthcoming in their relationship with us. They have already been more amenable to an understanding in Western Europe, they have arrived at a Berlin agreement, and they are talking about a European security pact. When the President goes to Moscow in May, there will be some kind of understanding on limitations of defensive missiles, and possibly later on offensive missiles. The Russians have become more interested in establishing good relations with the United States; they are terribly worried about our flirtation with the Chinese.

No mention of this point will be found in the communique because this is one of the most important, possibly the most important thing, behind this coming together of these two great powers: an effort to establish a new balance of power in the world and to prevent what really has been taking place over the last years in a constant stressing of expansion of the Soviet position—not only in Eastern Europe, as seen by the Czech invasion, but also in the Mediterranean, as seen in Egypt, the expansion of the Soviet fleet, the missile force, and so on. This meeting between the two powers is a subtle way of attempting to contain Soviet power.

There were other reasons, too, from the Chinese point of view. Now to us it seems ridiculous to think of a fearful, rearmed, aggressive, and militant Japan. The Japanese seemed to have been disabused of militarism as the result of the Second World War, and of the American occupation and the relations which have been built up between Japan and this country since that war. But that is not the way the Chinese look at it. The Chinese have had an experience that we only had in a relatively small way, at Pearl Harbor. They have had their country invaded and devastated; it started in 1931 and continued almost without interruption until 1945, and they had some of the most terrible things happen to them in 1937. The world has now generally forgotten—but *not* the Chinese—the Japanese troops coming into Nanking, massacring almost 100,000 Chinese, and raping thousands and thousands of women, many of them just children. These memories have gone very deeply into the Chinese consciousness. When they look at Japan, they see two things: first, they have a memory of what happened in the past; secondly, they recognize that Japan has this tremendous economic power and technical development that they do not expect to match in this century, and they see Japan with a capability of developing in a very short term an overwhelming nuclear capacity and delivery system.

Now, it is true the Japanese have not been interested, at least on the surface, in nuclear rearmament. The country is a small island, making it a very good target for missiles; and the Japanese have to be careful. But the Chinese do not think in those terms. They do not know what is going to happen in the future in Japan. They are suspicious of the Japanese system, just as they are of our system, and they think there is a possibility that sometime there might be a switch in Japanese government, a move to the right. Then they would be confronted with this terrible threat on their eastern flank, while to the west they have the Soviet Union, and to the south they have an antagonist in India. There is a terrible fear of encirclement. Now, it may seem to us irrational, but it becomes very rational when a people believes it, and the Chinese nation believes it. This explains a great deal of the motivation behind their policy.

You will not see in this communique any reference to Japan. I doubt it very much, unless there is some very platitudinous reference to peace with Japan. But the Chinese also look to the United States for some kind of a balance here. They understand that the one country in a position to persuade Japan, nudge Japan, or keep Japan in a state of restraint is the United States and it is a triangular relationship with Japan, China, and the United States in a very strange way.

Although the Chinese will never say it publicly, I do not think that they have any objections to the United States remaining a strong naval and air power in the Pacific.

There are other considerations like the question of Indochina. We cannot expect and should not expect that the Chinese will twist the arm of the North Vietnamese to compel them to come to an understanding with us. First of all, the Chinese will not be able to do it because they do not control the North Vietnamese. The North Vietnamese have been able to exploit the Sino-Soviet ideological dispute. Hanoi and the North Vietnamese are very independent and they go their own way. Secondly, the Chinese, like the Russians, have a guilt complex about the North Vietnamese.

Once the Geneva Conference was in effect, the Vietnamese Communists—and I was in that area at that time—had control of that country. At that time, the French were close to being wiped out in French Indochina when the North Vietnamese went to the negotiating table. The Russians and Chinese twisted the arm of the North Vietnamese to get a much lesser agreement than the North Vietnamese could have gotten, that is, the Vietnamese Communists. They did this, and all of the Communist powers expected when the elections took place in 1956 that the Communists would get the country anyhow. Of course, the elections did not take place; instead the Geneva accords were abrogated as a consequence of American policy. The North Vietnamese have felt cheated ever since, and the Chinese are not going to repeat that bit of history again. So, from their point of view, it is pretty much hands-off. Although they would serve as an intermediary, of course, to facilitate the United States in getting out of that part of the world.

It may be that when we leave Indochina, we can draw the Chinese into some kind of regional agreement for the whole area, providing that we have arrived at an understanding with the Vietnamese that will tend to discourage any further external aggressions in Southeast Asia. But as far as the settlement of the war is concerned, we are going to have to deal with Hanoi and we can not expect anything from the Chinese.

There has been a lot of talk about trade with China, and it is very interesting to trade with the Chinese. There are beautiful curios to be purchased and some very nice things to buy, and some companies I suppose will find there will be a certain amount of profit, but really it is not a terribly serious factor. I think the projection for 1980, if we entered into an ideal trading situation with China, would be something like five-tenths of one per cent of our total trade, not much more than the trade we have now with Taiwan. I think it is a good thing to trade with the Chinese, and we should try to foster that trade, but it would involve no great windfall for the United States.

There is also a great deal of attention being given to the remarks made by Mao that the first thing he would ask of Nixon is a lot of aid. I think that is a lot of nonsense. I do not think the Chinese want aid in the ordinary sense of the word from the United States. They have had their experience with the Russians; they are determined to lift themselves up alone; and they are generally doing a good job of it industrially and technically.

They would like certain credits to be extended to them on a commercial basis—the same sort of credits which the United States extends to other countries and in some cases credits which were extended by other countries to businessmen in this country—but they do not have anything in mind in terms of large-scale aid. They are not going to be dependent upon the United States for their technical assistance. They are going to spread it around; they have enough countries they can go to, not only Japan and the United States but also West Germany, Sweden, Britain, and still others. These countries are all queued up to help the Chinese and profit by it in any way they can.

I have left until last a real toughy: Taiwan, which in some ways seems to present an almost insoluble problem. Everyone agrees that Taiwan is part of China, *everyone*—even perhaps some of the 12 million Taiwanese people. At the end of the Second World War we turned Taiwan over to Nationalist China. The Nationalist troops came in, and they looted and raped the island. The governor of the island who was responsible for this, Men Chen Yu, was eventually shot by Chiang Kai-shek, and the Taiwanese have not forgotten that experience. It contributed to the disillusionment of not only people on the mainland but also the Nationalists as well as the Communists to a large extent. But, in any case, there is no doubt that we recognize Taiwan as a part of China, as the island certainly has been in the past, except for an interim of 50 years during Japanese colonialism.

We recognize that fact, and it was a hands-off policy as far as Taiwan was concerned until the outbreak of the Korean War when President Truman completely reversed his position and put into the Taiwan Straits the United States Seventh Fleet. This action was a complete reversal of our position, at a time when the Chinese were not involved in the Korean War and when they had very little to do with its outbreak. At this period of time North Korea was a Soviet satellite. It is not a Soviet satellite today, nor is it a Chinese satellite. But we reversed our position. A subsequent treaty, ratified in 1955, with one party in the civil war was, in my opinion, a rank interference in a civil war. But almost 20 years have elapsed, and I do not feel that we have any particular responsibility to the Nationalists. I watched them for three years when they were on the mainland and I know of no other government which, in its conduct and its attitude toward its people, has less of a right to rule the Chinese than the Chiang Kai-shek government. But, nevertheless, there is a consideration as far as the 12 million Taiwanese are concerned. Over the last 20 years they have developed their own social system. Their economic life has been lifted up until its living standard is second to Japan. Now we have the responsibility of having interfered in 1954 and 1955 and of having compelled these people to accommodate themselves to another way of life; we must get ourselves out of this terrible imbroglio, and there we bear a responsibility.

From the Chinese point of view, they are absolutely determined to get back Taiwan. They consider it a part of their country; they consider it part of their honor to remove all foreign presence from their soil; they consider that Taiwan is a target of United States and Japanese colonialism; and they are also suspicious of having any part of their country not under their control as a possible source of counterrevolution. Even though they tend not to admit these considerations, they nonetheless think in these terms. And until we are prepared to abrogate our 1955 agreement with Taiwan, I doubt that we can establish formal diplomatic relations with the Chinese, although we will probably make some arrangements for contacts between the two governments. We can come fairly close to satisfying the Chinese. There is no doubt that we are going to remove the 8,000 troops that we have on Taiwan. Most of those troops are there simply because of the Taiwan War. We have no military bases on that island of any consequence, from the point of view of Taiwan itself. The Seventh Fleet no longer really patrols the Taiwan Straits. About every week or two, just to show the flag, we run a small boat through the Taiwan Straits; but, nevertheless, the defense commitment is there.

We have said that the people of Taiwan must talk to the people in Peking directly, and it is a responsibility for them to work out this thing themselves; this may happen after Chiang Kai-shek has passed from the political scene, but at the moment there is still this hang-up on the question of our defense commitment to the Taiwanese, and the question is not an easy one. I frankly do not know what can be done about it. Possibly the solution is to allow the situation to continue simmering until some kind of understanding can be worked out between Peking and Taiwan, possibly for autonomy. Even though there are autonomous regions elsewhere in China, we cannot delude ourselves that the Chinese will extend their Communist society to Taiwan. They are not going to allow a neocapitalist society or quasi-capitalist society to remain on Taiwan. The Chinese tactic on this thing is to get us, to the extent that they can, to leave the island, even if we do not abrogate the peace agreement; they feel that if we leave that island naked enough it will begin to break up from the inside. I think there is a good chance that finally some group on that island will make a deal with Peking and Peking will establish its authority over Taiwan. But Taiwan remains a tough problem.

That, then, is pretty much the balance sheet. I think we probably will get a communique establishing some channel of communications between the two countries. There will be a fostering of further exchanges—cultural, scientific, perhaps newsmen on a permanent basis—and we will continue to talk to the Chinese. That last thing, continuing to talk to the Chinese, to me, is the most important point: that we can come together, that we can discuss our problems, and that, I think, we can coexist. There is every reason for us to be working with the Chinese. We need not embrace them. They are committed to world revolution, but they are not committed to world revolution with military means. They want to propagate their ideas. There is no reason why we cannot compete with them on that basis. They have given up the kind of militant subversion they engaged in in Africa and elsewhere in 1965; today, it is kind of a competition into which we as a free society should be willing to enter. I think the Chinese do want to live and coexist with us, and I hope that the coexistence can happen.

The President's visit is the beginning of a long process. As the President said, the wall should come down. I do not think he has knocked the wall down, but he opened a sizable chunk in it so that we should see some light.

I will be glad to answer questions of anything you have in mind, either on foreign policy or anything in your own field at all.

QUESTION: I would like to ask about the cultural revolution and its significance.

TOPPING: Are you prepared to stay here for 20 days and 20 nights?

It is a very good question and a question which has not been satisfactorily answered. Perhaps we ought to talk about it first in general terms. It is not really what it seems to be on the surface in the sense of a cultural revolution. Some of it relates to culture, but a lot relates to every other aspect of Chinese life—particularly politics. It is not what we have seen on television as eruptions of madness. We only saw there a very turbulent, superficial aspect of the cultural revolution.

Basically, because the revolution could be divided into two spheres or aspects, it was, in great part, a power struggle. What happened was that the chief of state, Liu Shao-chi, who had come into control of the apparatus and particularly in the provinces of the party in government, was opposing Mao Tse-tung. Liu Shao-chi represented the pragmatists in China who believed in emphasizing production and its technical aspects whereas Mao believed more in socialist education—an ideology which would inspire workers to great heights in production—with less emphasis on the technical aspects. There was a difference between the two sides to some extent in terms of the arts; there was beginning, on the part of the pragmatists, a slight loosening up, a tolerance of classics, and some foreign influence. Mao does not believe in such flexibility at this present stage of the revolution. His belief, then and now, is that all of the arts should be tied into class struggle as a tool of the revolution in order to further the development and march toward the classless society.

As a second aspect of the conflict, one began to see under Liu Shao-chi a development of a society which had some strong resemblance to the Soviet society, that is, a highly structured sort of society having new classes of bureaucrats or officials being developed in terms of the new factory managers, government leaders, and commune heads, with very broad spread in income. Mao believed that the Soviet Union in this sense is going down the revisionist path. Therefore, if China was to keep on the road toward a classless society, this process would have to be smashed; there would have to be less differentiation among the people in terms of income, status, and position and there would be a complete integration between what he calls the masses—peasants and workers—and the intellectuals, government leaders, and managers. There was not a great deal of difference in foreign policy. The pragmatists probably stood for easing the crisis with the Soviet

Union and possibly turning to that country for some material assistance. Mao was completely against this belief, believing instead that a militant anti-Soviet policy should be carried through.

These were the two central issues.

When Mao, in 1966, struck back at Liu Shao-chi in order to take power again – although Mao was in control of the central organ of the Communist Party, he was not in control of the Peking municipal machinery or government or the provinces – he had to find a way of smashing his opposition. Through Lin Piao, who was his then closest comrade in arms since the purge, Mao had to a large extent control of the army. He did not want to turn the army loose on his opposition because he knew that such action might lead to civil war, a lot of shooting, and possible destruction of the country. He did not want to call out the workers; they might not be too responsive and also the action would interfere with production. So, for a weapon, he turned to the youth and said, "You are the Red Guard. You are the revolutionary successes. Go out and take possession of the offices, drive out the revisionists or the Liu Shao-chi people, carry out a revolution, and expunge foreign influence and the old ideas." They came out by the millions. Eleven million of them came up to Peking just to parade. But for a long period of time – 1967-68 – he lost control. The youths developed into factions and began fighting among themselves.

Mao really let the genie out of the bottle, and for a period of time the rest of the world had this impression of chaos, but that was only for a relatively short time. By late 1968, he called in the army; they packed a lot of the Red Guards off to the countryside, disbanded their organization, and peace was restored.

Where does Mao stand today in terms of the cultural revolution? First of all, his political opposition has been completely smashed. The purges since 1968 basically have been purges within Mao's own group. He has followed what we call a zigzag course in which he has handled challenges from the left and from the right. In 1968 he had a challenge from the left which he used the army to smash; in September 1971 he had a challenge on the right from the army leaders, during which he moved against the people on the right in the purge.

But, basically, in terms of the origin of the cultural revolution, he succeeded in ousting his opposition to a large extent, the Liu Shao-chi people – although some of them, having been 'retreaded,' are still in control in the countryside. He also began his enormous revival movement in the country, a cultural revival movement designed to keep China on the road to a classless society by tying the arts into the class struggle. It is going to be what he calls "a continuing revolution"; he has a theory of contradiction which contends that, at a given point in the development of a society, that society begins to develop new classes, as has occurred in the Soviet Union. To counteract the situation, another burst of revolutionary actions is needed to break down the ossification and to keep the country in the direction of a classless society.

I would say that he has made more progress in that direction than any Communist leader has in the past. I do not know what the prospects are for success, but if Mao is successful in his counter-action China will be the first true Communist society in history.

QUESTION: After withdrawing the British from the Indian Sea, the Russians have established themselves as a power in the Mediterranean and Indian Ocean areas. What do you think should be the role of the United States there?

TOPPING: I do not believe that it serves the United States or the cause of world peace for us to enter into a cold war engagement wherever the Russians happen to go. What is going to happen to the Russians, I think, is that they are going to have the same experience as the United States. Eventually, in a country such as Egypt where they have established bases, the Egyptians will throw them out in their own way, or the Russians will find it impossible to remain there. Already building up, as you probably know, is a very strong antagonism between the Egyptians and the Russians, which to me is a natural thing. I do not think any people find it tolerable for any long period of time to have foreign people on their soil.

As for the Russian naval vessels in the Mediterranean, they are showing the flag, but I think the Russians are always a little bit behind. I remember—during the three years I spent in the Soviet Union—the Russians showing me through a chemical factory or an automobile factory. It was invariably something that a nation like the United States or Germany had done 10 years earlier. Now they have discovered naval power, long after we discovered the limitations on naval power.

I think to some extent it is an attempt to show the flag, but it is also an expression of the strong influence of the military. The Soviet Union, too, has its Pentagon. Militarily speaking, I think it is a political force, but I don't think it is militarily important any longer that they have several cruisers in the Indian Ocean. I hope we do not get into competition with them.

On my part, what little I know of the Indian people—their sense of nationalism and their sense of independence—I do not think they are going to be unduly influenced by this, and the presence of, for example, Russian troops in the Bay of Bengal will never subdue a mob in Calcutta.

QUESTION: Would you describe the educational system in China and what one has to do to become a teacher there?

TOPPING: One of the things that happened as a result of the cultural revolution was that the schools closed down, virtually all of them, in 1967 and 1968. When they reopened, they had a new directive from Mao, and it was a directive that the period of school shall be short on virtually all levels. The universities, for example, have cut back to some extent. I can not give you a specific answer because it is different from place to place. The four- or five-year schools in some places cut back to two or three years; in middle schools it is from six years to five years. The ideological framework was that the period of schooling should be shortened; that there should be a far greater emphasis on practical and technical subjects that relate to production and much less on the academic subjects; and that there be a far heavier emphasis on the ideological. And once the directive was issued by Mao—who is a dramatic revolutionary and gets impatient with the details of government, an area in which Chou En-lai is a genius—it did not go much further. This past summer when my wife and I were traveling around China visiting the universities and middle schools, we found that the people running the schools were in real trouble because it is one thing to lay down a general principle, but it is another thing to work out new curricula for this new regime, to get faculty capable of doing it, and to formulate new systems of bringing in students. We found a great state of transition and of upheaval, things that an outsider would not see in Peking schools where everything seems very orderly. Taking a good look at some of these classes and wandering around freely—my wife and I were alone in the sense of no reporters—we found, for example, the textbooks were stamped "experimental." So they are trying to work this thing out.

How are they going to do this? My own view is that their present concept of education is pretty romantic. Mao in one sense says the emphasis will be on the practical, but in another way he is talking about turning out engineers in two or three years. Many of the students coming into engineering classes are workers from factories and who are without the basic mathematics. There is a lot of turbulence in Chinese education which I think will sort itself out after a time.

But apart from those really broad principles which I just outlined, I cannot go much further than that. There are some very disturbing aspects to it; let me give you one example. We went up to Manchuria or what they call the Northeast now. I was looking forward to that visit because there were two particular academies I was interested in seeing: the Conservatory of Music and the Academy of Fine Arts. All of the students and all of the faculty of the academy and the conservatory had been packed off to the countryside for reeducation and integration with the peasant workers, because they had been fooling around with what is called bourgeois music or revisionism, that is, the Soviet influence in music. Also, in fine arts, they had begun painting and sculpturing, which leads away from social realism. When we arrived in a part of the provinces, we saw that some of them were working on an enormous project just outside the door of the hotel—a 30-foot statue of Mao Tse-tung. Such was the epitome of social realism. While I doubt that the cultural revolution aftermath will be in those terms, this is nonetheless part of the ideological drive.

On the other hand, looking at education as whole, I do not think that the Chinese educational system can be compared with ours. They are going through a revolution and they have their own problems. When I left China in 1949, 80 percent of the population was *illiterate*, today, 90 percent is *literate;* when you begin to understand this enormous change then you begin to understand what an enormous educational achievement has been brought about. Today, in China, the children have access to middle schools almost everywhere up to the first two or three years, not just primary school. After a time, I think, every child will certainly have access to a full five years of school.

The Chinese are working out some things which are not particularly new but interesting; they have been tested in the Soviet Union and elsewhere. For example, graduation from middle school does not automatically qualify a candidate for college. He must spend an additional two or three years working as a peasant on a commune, in a factory, or in army service. After that is over, the prospective student's suitability for a particular school is voted upon by a committee. In some instances a lot of formal credentials are unnecessary. There are no entrance examinations. That has been abolished. Some workers are entering college with very limited backgrounds, maybe one or two years of middle school. I do not think any remedial program has yet been worked out. So, it is an interesting experiment, and I do think that the concept of bringing the people in the schools and universities closer to the masses of the country—in a country which is going through an enormous effort to wrench itself out of poverty—has succeeded by establishing a minimum standard of living. I think hunger has been eliminated in China, another fantastic achievement.

You cannot judge education in China by our standards. You have to look at it *within the context of their problems and of their particular stage of history.*

QUESTION: What have the Chinese students been told about the United States? Will this visit and items about it in their newspapers have some reeducation emphasis for teachers there?

TOPPING: The students in the classroom, the people generally, and all of the media are told constantly that the United States is an imperialist nation and the enemy of the people of the world and that the United States has been hostile to China; but the statements always place the emphasis on *government*. They are told, also, that the people of the United States are friendly to the people of China and that the people of the two countries should get together. There is a strong distinction between the government and the people. If you go back to Mao Tse-tung's speeches made around 1945, this emphasis is apparent. The result is that if an American were to go to China tomorrow and to wander around without a lot of official escorts, he would find the people genuinely friendly and interested in him. He would not find hostility.

As far as the future is concerned, I think the policy will not change very much after the Nixon visit; there might be a somewhat more friendly tone. There probably will be reservations about attacking the President personally, but in general the people will be told, as in the past, that the United States is following policies which are antagonistic to China. Until a real change occurs in the relationship between the two countries, they still will be attacking us on the basis of our social system. People in China are generally told that our social system is one of exploitation. Also until the United States becomes socialist, the people will not be fully liberated; they interpret the civil rights movement in our country, the anti-war movement to some extent, the labor action as pieces of evidence that a revolution is coming about in the United States to transform it into socialism.

QUESTION: What do you foresee when Mao passes from the political scene?

TOPPING: I think the problem is very serious because virtually all of the top leadership are aged—in their seventies. There are two people, one in the fifties and one in the forties, in the Politburo, but they were brought up very quickly for political reasons—which I will not go into—they do not have broad experience nor could they really run the party. Mao is 78; his health is not particularly good. Chou En-lai will be 74 this year, and he has had some problems with his health. So I think there will be a period of real difficulty involved in the transition and succession. I do not think it has been worked out. Of course, this latest purge took Lin Piao; he was 64 and had been tubercular, but at least he had been named in the 1969 constitution as a successor, providing some continuity. Now that is gone.

I think there are very good young people who might come up from the middle echelons, but there is no assurance of the continuity of the present policy. There might be turbulence again, but I imagine they are trying to deal with that problem; in fact, I believe that, during the course of the Nixon visit, Chou En-lai made some sort of remark to the President about the fact that there were so many relatively young people in the American entourage; and then he said, "You must understand we were revolutionaries for a long time and we only have had a short time to rule this country, to administer this country." That is true. You cannot expect men who fought for power from 1927 to 1949 as revolutionaries just to give it up. Just the typical sort of lives they led and the sacrifices they made are beyond belief for us. I remember once, in 1948, I crossed into the Communist areas during a great battle in Chinchow, a decisive battle of the war in which a half million Nationalist troops were knocked out. I spent one night with one typical Communist commander who was then 48, and I talked to him about his life. He had been in the field fighting since 1937. He was a relatively young man. Others had been in the field since 1927, on and off. Since 1937 he had only seen his family *once* in eleven years. And the war went on until the end of 1949. Having been through this, the revolutionary has reluctance to give up power. But a great central question remains unanswered: what are they going to do about the future? I do not think they have worked it out yet.

QUESTION: By what means have the Chinese achieved their almost universal literacy?

TOPPING: China is a highly organized totalitarian state, and they have given priority to basic education because they can understand that, in order to lift up their society, this is what had to be done. They have just taken their meager resources and allocated them according to those priorities; schools have been one of those priorities, and the result is that action was not left up to every municipality. *The orders came down from Peking for well established schools.* When you travel around China, you find that you go into many classrooms that do not have a lot of fancy accouterments. Some schools are just simple wooden buildings with blackboards and rough desks, and that is it. But they are well structured and they are heated; classes are run with considerable discipline, although not the sort of discipline we have seen on television in which little kids perform obediently by rote. There is some of that, but the Chinese kids are like kids any place else. They are fairly well disciplined, but they are not the sort of robots suggested by controlled performances carried out for television cameras. And that is about it.

They wiped out the drug traffic and addiction in China. In a totalitarian society, authorities can state that there is not going to be any more drug traffic or addiction, and then they can pack off the addicts. If they do not pack them off to hospitals, the authorities have the community assume the responsibility to see that the addict is made a nonaddict. And he *is* made a nonaddict because he cannot get drugs and because everybody around him shares in the responsibility for his welfare. If anybody dealing in drugs is picked up, he will go perhaps to a prison, or within his own community, he will go through a process of reeducation in which there will be endless discussions with him. After a number of years he will probably be released; if he went back to drugs, they would shoot him. They would not shoot him in the first instance. There is very little capital punishment in China, but they do it. All of this is on a very unsophisticated and basic level, and it is very difficult to draw comparisions between societies on this level. Their problems are different and they work on a level they consider useful to a solution. There are not that many solutions for our problems in China.

When I came back from China I had a lot of young people come to me and talk to me in terms of, "You've been to China. You've been to Shangri-la. They've really got it there. There is something there." Some of our youngsters call themselves Maoists. It is just not true, and the Chinese would be the first ones to tell you they do not believe in American Maoists. They believe in people solving their own problems, and they have particular problems which they are working to solve, I think, with enormous energy and considerable efficiency and dedication; and I admire them tremendously for it. But they have a very special society with very special problems, and they deal with it in a very special way. They have some total solutions which are pretty damn rigorous. When some of the young people have talked to me about moving these things over to the United States, I have, in turn, told them what they would have to do if they were in a Communist society in terms of the personal or individual freedom that would be denied them; it is impossible for them to accept it. So I just add that, while I think the Chinese are doing some marvelous things in terms of lifting up their own society, I must issue this caution, that the society is different. I do not think we can pass easy judgment on them in terms of our own criteria, nor am I sure that there is that much that can evolve from it.

QUESTION: In Hong Kong you have a very capitalistic society but adjoining it, of course, you have the communist society. I observed many more people wanting to go into Hong Kong where there is poverty but opportunity than those wishing to go from Hong Kong to China. Many of these people in Hong Kong have said they did not want to go to Communist China, but those who did wanted the opportunities which had been in Hong Kong. Also, how do you think most of the young people in China feel, if they had the choice?

TOPPING: The people who came to Hong Kong had problems. They had political problems, they had problems of dislocation in China, and they had associations with people in Hong Kong. There are still about a thousand refugees coming every month into Hong Kong out of a country of 800 million people. I think that there are quite a number of people who would try to go to Hong Kong because the Chinese country is regimented and because of the difficulties in making this enormous revolutionary effort. In every revolutionary effort there is a lot of human debris, that is, a lot of people get hurt or suffer unkind acts. I think there would be a lot of people who might very well want to go into Hong Kong.

But I lived in Hong Kong for a year and I knew a number of Chinese there, and while they had a lot of individualism and freedom, they also experienced a strange sort of disorientation. They did not know to what they were related, what they were doing in life; they had an enormous suicide rate, a lot of unhappiness, a lot more disease, and a tremendous amount of drug addiction, venereal disease, and prostitution. If I were a young Chinese, I think I would like to stay in my own country. Many of the young people who escaped to Hong Kong because they did not like the idea of what was happening or because during the cultural revolution they were sent to work in villages with peasants have a nostalgia to return after a time.

In general, I think that the people of China—the ones I have encountered—are content and happy in their country. They are content and happy because of the comparison with what it was before. It would be difficult for me to convey to you what it was like before the Communists. The people were hungry, in the villages they were abused, they were subject to corrupt officials, to usury, to landlords who could do whatever they wanted with the peasants. If the peasant did not pay his taxes to the landlord, the landlord could take a woman of the peasant's family as a concubine, as a maid, or anything else. As far as the women are concerned, they had no rights in the household or any place else. Today, the people have lost some of this individualism but they have a certain voice in the management of their village affairs which they never had. They have a social security system which takes care of them, a free medical system, free education, and a guaranteed minimum standard of life. The women have equal rights before the law in the economy and in the household: the right of abortion, education, and divorce. They are, above all, no longer slaves.

So I think that on balance, the Chinese people are relatively content and happy. Those who have a taste for good living may, after a time, develop new interests and new tastes. Instead of being ascetic about getting a sewing machine or a bicycle, they may want a television set or a washing machine or a refrigerator. They do not have refrigerators. It may be that after a time they will want more freedom, perhaps the freedom to travel. There are restrictions on travel within the country as well as outside the country. It may be that they will get fed up with going to political meetings all the time. It may be that they would want to read more than the highly restricted material they are given.

These things probably will happen in the future, as they have happened in the Soviet Union; but right now, the Chinese people compare what life was 10 or 20 years ago to what it is today, and they are very happy about it. Again, what may be good for a Chinese peasant in terms of an historical sense may be appalling to us; but we are not talking about life in this country, we are talking about life in China.